

# modern

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

# language

VOL. LXXVI, NO. 1, JANUARY 1961

# notes

---

- 1 Chaucer's *Troilus*, iv. 1585: A Biblical Allusion?  
ALBERT C. BAUGH and E. T. DONALDSON
- 5 "Private Personage Unknowne" of Spenser's Letter to Harvey.  
PAUL E. MCLANE
- 7 Shelley's Magus Zoroaster and the Image of the Doppelgänger.  
MARGARET LOFTUS RANALD and RALPH ARTHUR RANALD
- 13 Walton's *Angler* and Donne: A Probable Allusion.  
FRANK MANLEY
- 15 *Paradise Lost*: *Felix Culpa* and the Problem of Structure.  
WILLIAM H. MARSHALL
- 20 Time and Mrs. Newsome's "Blue Message": A Reply to Leon Edel.  
R. W. STALLMAN
- 24 *The Waste Land* in *A Farewell to Arms*.  
DONNA GERSTENBERGER
- 25 A Clever Tale in Early Spanish Prose.  
WALTER D. KLINE
- 29 *Cancionero de Baena* No. 237: "Cativa muy triste."  
DOROTHY CLOTELLE CLARKE
- 34 Currency Inflation Reflected in Luis Vélez's de Guevara's *El embuste acreditado*.  
ARNOLD G. REICHENBERGER
- 35 The Friendship and Enmity Between Quevedo and Juan de Jáuregui.  
JAMES O. CROSBY
- 39 Denial, Affirmation, and Escape in the Wager and *Hexenkueche* Scenes of Goethe's *Faust*.  
DOUGLAS F. BUB
- 43 The Genesis of an Abstract Poem: A Note on August Stramm.  
CHRISTOPH HERING

## REVIEWS

48 MARJORIE HOPE NICOLSON, *Mountain Gloom and Mountain Glory: The Development of the Aesthetics of the Infinite* (JEAN H. HAGSTRUM)

51 VERNON J. HARWARD, JR., *The Dwarfs of Arthurian Romance and Celtic Tradition* (HELAINE NEWSTEAD)

53 EDWIN HAVILAND MILLER, *The Professional Writer in Elizabethan England. A Study of Nondramatic Literature* (HAROLD JENKINS)

55 CHARLES RYSKAMP, *William Cowper of the Inner Temple, Esq. A Study of His Life and Works to the Year 1768* (LUDWICK HARTLEY)

58 E. D. HIRSCH, JR., *Wordsworth and Schelling. A Typological Study of Romanticism* (NEWTON P. STALLKNECHT)

64 DAVID LEVIN, *History as Romantic Art* (CHARLES A. BARKER)

66 KLAUS LANZINGER, *Primitivismus und Naturalismus im Prosaschaffen Herman Melvilles* (JAMES BAIRD)

70 LOUISE COWAN, *The Fugitive Group. A Literary History* (ROBERT D. JACOBS)

72 FREDERICK L. GWYNN and JOSEPH L. BLOTNER, editors, *Faulkner in the University* (CHARLES ANDERSON)

75 MARGARET GILMAN, *The Idea of Poetry in France. From Houdar de la Motte to Baudelaire* (HERBERT DIECKMANN)

81 STENDHAL, *De l'Amour*, ed., HENRI MARTINEAU (JULES C. ALCIATORE)

83 SCEUR MARIE-MARGARITA, S. N. D., *La Métrique de Francis Jammes* (R. CHAMPIGNY)

85 JUAN BAUTISTA AVALLE-ARCE, *La Novela Pastoril Espaniola* (HELMUT HATZFELD)

88 GERARDO MOLDENHAUER and RAUL ECHAURI, eds., *El Teatro del Barroco Alemán. Antología Bilingüe; Selección Prólogo y Notas* (BLAKE LEE SPAHR)

90 WOLFGANG PEHNT, *Zeiterlebnis und Zeitdichtung in Goethes Lyrik* (DOUGLAS F. BUB)

92 EITEL WOLF DOBERT, *Deutsche Demokraten in Amerika, Die Achtundvierziger und ihre Schriften* (ADOLF E. ZUCKER)

93 HARVEY W. HEWETT-THAYER, *American Literature as Viewed in Germany, 1818-1861* (ADOLF E. ZUCKER)

95 EINAR ÓL. SVEINSSON, *Dating the Icelandic Sagas: An Essay in Method* (STEPÁN EINARSSON)

---

## MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

BRUCE W. WARDROPPER,

*General Editor*

HENRY HORNICK,

*Managing Assistant*

DON CAMERON ALLEN

CHARLES R. ANDERSON

NATHAN EDELMAN

STEFÁN EINARSSON

JOHN FRECCERO

RENÉ N. GIRARD

J. LIONEL GOSSMAN

RICHARD H. GREEN

ANNA G. HATCHER

HAROLD JANTZ

WILLIAM H. McCLAIN

J. HILLIS MILLER

LAWRENCE J. ROSS

CHARLES S. SINGLETON

EARL R. WASSERMAN

Published eight times annually, November through June. Subscription: \$8.00 in the United States; \$8.25 in Canada; \$8.50 in other countries. Single issue, \$1.25. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore 18, Md. Claims for replacement of missing numbers must be received within 3 months (6 months in the case of foreign subscribers) following publication of the number.

Contributors and publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to *Modern Language Notes*, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore 18, Md. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped return envelope. In preparing manuscripts, contributors are requested to follow the *MLA Style Sheet*.

Second-class postage paid at Baltimore, Maryland.

# modern language notes

VOL. LXXVI, NO. 1, JANUARY 1961

## Chaucer's *Troilus*, iv. 1585: A Biblical Allusion?

### I

In a recent issue of *MLN* (LXXIV, No. 7) Mr. L. G. Evans offers a new interpretation of a line in Chaucer's *Troilus*, which indeed has not been adequately explained. I venture to think that the interpretation which he proposes is not the correct one, and, what is perhaps more serious, that the inferences which he draws from it distort our picture of Chaucer as a poet.

The line in question is part of the discussion between Troilus and Criseyde as to what is best to do, now that Criseyde is to be sent to the Greek camp in exchange for Antenor. After rejecting Troilus's proposal that they flee the city, she undertakes to persuade him that she will be eternally faithful, that she will find a way of returning to Troy within ten days, and that it is best to accept the decision of the Trojan parliament. To support her argument she reminds him of two popular sayings:

Men seyn, 'the suffrant ouercomith,' pardie;  
Ek 'whoso wol han lief, he lief moot lete.'

The first of these sayings causes no trouble; it is the well-attested proverb *Vincit qui patitur*. It is the second which Mr. Evans feels needs a better explanation.

The usual interpretation is "whoever wishes to have a dear thing must give up a dear thing" (Root), and in support of this interpretation Skeat, Root, and Robinson quote one of Heywood's proverbs, "Nought lay down, nought take up." While admitting that "the meaning of Heywood's proverb is clearly that of Chaucer's line as interpreted by the two modern editors" (Root and Robinson), Mr. Evans objects that "the modes of expression remain wholly unlike."

Accordingly he proposes to take the word *lief* in the sense of *lyf* and interprets the statement as an allusion to *Matt. x. 39*: *He that findeth his life shall lose it: and he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it.* Furthermore, on the strength of this allusion he reads into the passage a special irony, since the audience already knows that Troilus is doomed to "losse of lyf." He carries the interpretation still further: "Thus 'parde' in line 1584 sets up the audience for a Christian reminder, and this reminder in turn underscores a continuing theme in the poem. It connects the Proem to Book IV with the soaring conclusion to Book V through its ironic reminder that Troilus has not given his life to Christ, but to the world, the world where Fortune's reign dictates his tragic end."

Whether we can attribute to Chaucer the alleged ironical overtone and the larger structural intention of connecting the Proem to Book IV with the conclusion of the poem by means of this Christian allusion depends upon whether line 1585 is indeed an allusion to *Matt. x. 39* and other Biblical passages expressing the same idea. If it is not, the superstructure is deprived of its foundation.

It would be natural to suppose that since Chaucer's "Men seyn" introduces a proverb (as Mr. Evans agrees), the "Ek" immediately following introduces another popular saying. And indeed it does. As I note in my forthcoming edition of Chaucer's major poetry, it is quite well attested in the Middle Ages. Thus it occurs in the thirteenth-century *Proverbia Rusticorum*:<sup>1</sup>

Qui ne done ke il aime, ne prent que desire.

It appears again in *Li Proverbe au Vilain*:<sup>2</sup>

Qui ne done que aime, ne prent que desire.

<sup>1</sup> J. Zacher, "Altfranzösische Sprichwörter," *ZfDA*, xi (1859), 114-144 (No. 32).

<sup>2</sup> Ed. Adolf Tobler, Leipzig, 1895. In another collection of proverbs called *Li Respit del Courteis et del Vilain* (ed. E. Stengel, *ZfSL*, xiv (1892), 154-158) it appears with the more usual wording *Ki ne doune ceo k'il ayme*,

which is duly noted by Morawski.<sup>3</sup> It also appears in various Latin forms:

Non capit optatum qui non impedit amatum.  
Non feret optatum qui rem non donat amatam.  
Non capit optatum qui non largitur amatum.  
Qui non dat quod amat, non accipit ille quod optat.

I refrain from giving references, since they can easily be found in Singer.<sup>4</sup>

It may be added, however, as evidence of the proverb's currency that it is found outside of medieval collections of proverbs. Thus the discussion of the Seven Deadly Sins in *Le Mireour du Monde*<sup>5</sup> begins: *Qui ne donne que aime, ne prend que desire.* It appears in the same form in *Le Debat du Clerc et de la Damoiselle*,<sup>6</sup> where the Clerc says:

Prenez garde au proverbe qu'ous avez oï dire:  
Qui ne donne que aime, si ne prend que desire.  
(ll. 113-4)

In the twelfth-century fabliau-like *Dit de Richaut*<sup>7</sup> the wording is interesting when compared with Chaucer's *lief*:

Qui (Ms. quil) ne done ce que chier tient,  
A ce qu'il aime, a poine vient. (ll. 1170-1)

Similar is the couplet in *La Decrissions des Relegions*<sup>8</sup> by Huon le Roi de Cambrai (13th c.):

Qui ne donne ce qu'il a chier  
Ne prend mie çou qu'il desire. (ll. 167-8)

Since the proverb is also found in German, Provençal, and Italian, it is clear that it had considerable currency and that Chaucer's use of it should therefore cause no surprise.

*ne prend ceo k'il desire*, and this is the wording in still another collection published by M. Förster, "Frühmittelenglische Sprichwörter," *ESt*, **xxxii** (1902), 1-20 (No. 49).

\* *Proverbes français antérieurs au XV<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris, 1925; *CFMA*, No. 47). (No. 2023).

\* Samuel Singer, *Sprichwörter des Mittelalters*, 3v. (Bern, 1944-47), II. 23. See also "The Proverbs of Serlo of Wilton," ed. A. C. Friend, *Mediaeval Studies*, **xvi** (1954), 196, and the additional examples there cited.

\* Ed. F. Chavannes (Lausanne, 1846), p. 23.

\* Ed. A. Jeanroy, *Romania*, **XLIII** (1914), 1-17.

\* D. M. Méon, *Nouveau recueil de fabliaux et contes . . . 2v.* (Paris, 1823), I. 74.

\* *Huon le Roi de Cambrai: Œuvres*, ed. A. Långfors (Paris, 1925; *CFMA*, No. 13), p. 31.

It is always worth while to establish correctly the meaning of a line in Chaucer, but in the present note I am even more concerned to point out how dangerous it is to attribute irony, structural symbolism, and other artistic intentions to Chaucer on the basis of speculative interpretations of the text.

*University of Pennsylvania*

ALBERT C. BAUGH

## II

Mr. Evans' emendation to *lyf* of the repeated *lief* in *Troilus* 4.1585 (*MLN* LXXIV [1959], 584-7) ignores both linguistic and editorial principles. He suggests that scribes wrote *lief* for an original *lyf* because the words were homonyms with which they had difficulty. But they were not homonyms: the vowel in *lief* is long close *e*, for which *ie* is a French spelling, while the vowel in *lyf* is long *i*; if the two sounds had fallen together, the words would be pronounced alike in Modern English. Nor were the words even homographs during the period when most of the Chaucer MSS were being copied: *lyf* for *lief* is a post-vowel-shift spelling, but for scribes of literary MSS during much of the 15th century the usual spellings for "lief" were *lief*, *leef*, *lef*, and for "life" *lyf*, *lif*, though forms with unsounded final *-e* on the latter word also appear frequently. Furthermore, the two words were not especially susceptible to scribal interchange. Manly-Rickert and Root record only four substitutions of apparent "lief" for "life" in about 310 opportunities in the *Canterbury Tales* and *Troilus* (A3019 *Ra*<sup>1</sup>], B210[*McRa*<sup>1</sup>], B230[*Bw*], G482[*D1*]), and in the first case the scribe was thinking not about "lief," but about "leaf" or "leave," while in the last, scribal *leve* is the lengthened form of the verb "live" (with original short *i*). Conversely, there are four substitutions of *lyf* for uninflected *lief* in about one-tenth the number of opportunities in the same poems (A3792[*Ha*<sup>3</sup>], B1322[*Tc*<sup>1</sup>], B3084[*Ln*], B3468[*BwIi*]), not counting I948 where all MSS read *lyf* for what was probably original *lief* (see Robinson's note). If these statistics suggest any significant potentiality for confusion between the two words, they suggest what any editor might suspect, that *lief* is more likely to be altered to *lyf* than the opposite. While both words are so common that neither is *durior* than the other in any absolute sense, *lyf* is so much commoner that fatigued or momentarily distracted scribes might easily write it for

*lief*. And in the present case, *lief* seems genuinely *durior*: *lyf* makes such good immediate sense that if Chaucer had originally written it there would be little reason for any scribe to substitute the less expected *lief*, particularly in view of the probability that scribes would, like Evans, have recognized the Biblical text that the line would then reflect. Easy, familiar sense rarely gives way to something more remote. On the other hand, the tug exerted by the Biblical text might readily influence a scribe to see only *l-f* and to write *lyf* for an original *lief*, as the scribe of the Durham MS did.

Evans' point that *lief* occurs nowhere else in Chaucer as a neuter substantive is not relevant: parallel instances may properly be adduced to support a given reading, but their absence proves nothing about it. Nor am I sure that his statement is correct, for in the expression "for *lief* ne (or) *looth*" (B1322, LGW 1639), the adjectives may be construed as neuter substantives. It is similarly irrelevant that no editor cites a proverb that exactly fits Chaucer's line: the number of undoubtedly proverbs would be foolishly reduced if we were to eliminate all those that we have so far found recorded only once.

It is well that accepted readings of Chaucer's text be subjected to constant challenge, but the challenger should remember that Chaucer's editors have been highly competent and should assume that any given reading was not thoughtlessly chosen. Before suggesting an emendation he ought, ideally, to survey all the evidence pro and con. In his pleasure at detecting a certain kind of meaning in Chaucer, Evans has failed to do this.

*Yale University*

E. T. DONALDSON

“Private Personage Unknowne”  
of Spenser’s Letter to Harvey

In Spenser's letter to Gabriel Harvey of October 15 and 16, 1579, there is a vague but generally accepted reference to the *Shephearde's Calender* and Spenser's thought of dedicating it to the Earl of Leicester. "Then also me seemeth the work too base for his excellent Lordship, being made in Honour of a private Personage unknowne, which of some yl-willers might be upbraided, not to be so worthie,

as you knowe she is: or the matter not so weightie, that it should be offred to so weightie a Personage. . . ."

Who is this "private Personage unknowne" to whom Spenser had originally intended to dedicate the *Calender*? A. C. Judson declares that Spenser here is obviously referring to Rosalind.<sup>1</sup> In the Variorum Gottfried cites Child's opinion that this unknown private personage is undoubtedly Rosalind and apparently accepts Child's conjecture.<sup>2</sup>

But in the light of statements made about Rosalind by E. K. and Piers (*October*, 93-94) in the *Calender*, and by Spenser himself in the last fifty lines of the later *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe*, it would be difficult to view Rosalind as someone whose true worth many would not recognize. To cite a single instance, in a gloss to *April* E. K. writes that "it is well known" that Rosalind is a "Gentle woman of no meane house, nor endewed with anye vulgare and common gifts both of nature and manners."

As we know from the Spenser-Harvey letters, Spenser was very much in love at this time. He probably married Machabyas Chylde within two weeks after mentioning in the letter to Harvey the unknown private person whom he originally wished to honor in bringing out the *Calender*.<sup>3</sup> Is it not more likely that Spenser had determined to dedicate the *Calender* to his bride, Machabyas Chylde—a nobody in the eyes of the great, even though Spenser and Harvey knew her true worth. Those that Spenser was associated with at Leicester House—Sidney, Dyer, Rogers, etc.—undoubtedly knew of Spenser's coming marriage and his intention to honor Machabyas in the dedication of the *Calender*. A shift in his plans, as Spenser intimates in an earlier part of the letter, might provoke scorn from prominent ones at Court, or a questioning of his motives. Also Spenser feels that the *Calender* in its present form is not "weighty" enough to dedicate to Leicester.

Spenser undoubtedly added further weight in the next seven weeks—the political eclogues and fables—before handing the *Calender* to the licenser and printer.<sup>4</sup> In light of this added weight, the actual

<sup>1</sup> *Life of Edmund Spenser* (Baltimore, 1945), p. 61.

<sup>2</sup> *Prose Works* (Baltimore, 1949), p. 249.

<sup>3</sup> A few scholars regard Spenser's sweetheart of the letters and Rosalind as the same person, but as both Judson (p. 45) and Gottfried (p. 249) point out, Spenser's defence of Rosalind's rejection in the later *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe* makes this conjecture untenable.

On Spenser's marriage to Machabyas on October 27, 1579, see Judson, p. 63.

<sup>4</sup> The composition of the *Calender* is a difficult problem to solve, but the allegory suggests that a good many additions and substitutions were made

dedication to Philip Sidney was not unsuitable, for Sidney was on friendly terms with Spenser, interested in the *Calender* as an example of the "new" poetry, and of course very much involved in the political problems allegorized in the *Calender*.

*University of Notre Dame*

PAUL E. McLANE

## Shelley's Magus Zoroaster and the Image of the Doppelgänger

Almost all editors of Shelley have passed over Act I, lines 191-221 of *Prometheus Unbound* in silence, or have merely labelled the passage obscure. The scene is a dialogue between The Earth and the imprisoned Prometheus:

### THE EARTH

... Ere Babylon was dust,  
The Magus Zoroaster, my dead child,  
Met his own image walking in the garden.  
That apparition, sole of men, he saw.  
For know there are two worlds of life and death:  
One that which thou beholdest; but the other  
Is underneath the grave, where do inhabit  
The shadows of all forms that think and live,  
Till death unite them and they part no more;  
Dreams and the light imaginings of men,  
And all that faith creates or love desires,  
Terrible, strange, sublime, and beauteous shapes.  
There thou art, and dost hang, a writhing shade,  
'Mid whirlwind-peopled mountains; all the gods

---

shortly before publication (Spenser's usual practice). There was ample time for extensive revision in the eight month interim between the date affixed to E. K.'s Epistle to Harvey (April 10, 1579) and the licensing date (December 5, 1579). For instance, cf. my "The Death of A Queen: Spenser's Dido as Elizabeth," *HLQ*, xviii (1954), 1-11, and my "James VI in the *Shephearde's Calender*," *HLQ*, xvi (1953), 273-85. In these articles I set forth strong reasons why the elegy over Dido and the fable of the Fox and the Kid were probably written between mid-October and late November, 1579.

Furthermore, Mary Parmenter has pointed out that the Rosalind eclogues, unlike most of the others, have little or no connection with the moral teachings of the months in the old *Kalendar*. "Spenser's Twelve *A*Eclogues Proportionable to the Twelve Monethes," *ELH*, III (1936), 199. This fact might indicate that they were written late, to substitute for earlier material, and carry a heavy burden of political allegory.

Are there, and all the powers of nameless worlds,  
Vast, sceptred phantoms; heroes, men, and beasts;  
And Demogorgon, a tremendous gloom;  
And he, the supreme Tyrant, on his throne  
Of burning gold. Son, one of these shall utter  
The curse which all remember. Call at will  
Thine own ghost, or the ghost of Jupiter,  
Hades or Typhon, or what mightier Gods  
From all-prolific Evil, since thy ruin,  
Have sprung, and trampled on my prostrate sons.  
Ask, and they must reply: so the revenge  
Of the Supreme may sweep through vacant shades,  
As rainy wind through the abandoned gate  
Of a fallen palace.

#### *PROMETHEUS*

Mother, let not aught  
Of that which may be evil, pass again  
My lips, or those of aught resembling me.  
Phantasm of Jupiter, arise, appear!<sup>1</sup>

Professor George E. Woodberry glossed this passage as follows:

I. 192 *et seq. Zoroaster.* The story is not known to Zoroastrian literature. The conception of the double world of shades and forms, with the reunion of the two after death, seems original with Shelley, suggested by the notion of Plato's world of ideas.<sup>2</sup>

Miss Vida D. Scudder, in her edition of *Prometheus Unbound*, affixed this note to the same passage:

1. 195. *For know, there are two worlds.* An obscure passage. Perhaps it is foolish to seek for an adequate explanation of this strange underworld, and we may best ascribe the fancy to the lingering love of magic which so bewitched Shelley's boyhood. The sphere of Memory, of the Imagination, of Platonic archetypes, is vaguely suggested.<sup>3</sup>

In view of these two observations, and of the apparent inability of later commentators to improve upon them, it might seem pointless to reopen the subject, especially as a further search of more recent Zoroastrian material appears to yield no fresh possibilities of interpretation. Shelley's interest in and use of Zoroastrian themes and ideas have been well established, but it is not likely that he found

<sup>1</sup> *The Complete Poetical Works of Percy Bysshe Shelley*, ed. George E. Woodberry, revised edition (Boston, 1901), p. 168. Hereafter cited as *Works*.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 622.

<sup>3</sup> *Percy Bysshe Shelley, Prometheus Unbound*, ed. Vida D. Scudder (Boston, 1892), p. 146.

this incident of self-confrontation in any writings dealing with the Persian religious teacher. However, an entirely different approach to this poetic crux is made possible by considering the problem of confrontation by a ghostly double. Continual references in folk belief to the *doppelgänger*, as well as Shelley's own demonstrated interest in this and other supernatural or occult phenomena, lead to an exploration of the possibility that the poet was making use here, for his own symbolic ends, of the Teutonic and Celtic belief that confrontation by one's own image, or the sight of another person's double, is a presage of death to the person so divided.

This superstition may be found expressed in England in such an important document as the well-known *Of Ghostes and Sprites Walking by Nyght*, by Ludwig Lavater (1572):

It happeneth many times, that when men lye sicke of some deadly disease, there is some thing heard going in ye chamber, like as the sicke men were wonte, when they were in good health: yea & the sicke parties them selues, do many times hear the same, and by and by gesse what wil come to passe. Oftentimes a litle before they yeld vp the ghost, and some time a little after their death, or a good while after, either their owne shapes, or some other shaddowes of men are apparently seene.\*

John Aubrey, in his *Miscellanies* of 1696, also alludes to ghostly confrontation occurring shortly before the death of the subject:

*De seipso duplicato*

*Cardanus, Syntagma Somniorum*, lib. ii. cap. 12. *In somniis mortis est signum, quia duo fiunt, sum anima separatur a corpore. Est & signum morbi in ipsis aegrotantibus, nec tum aliud quicquam significat.*

*Of One's being divided into a Two-fold Person*

In dreams it is a sign of death, because out of one are then made two, when the soul is separated from the body. And it is a sign of the disease in sick men, nor signifies it any thing else at that time.

As concerning apparitions of a man's own self, there are sundry instances, some whereof, I shall here set down.

The beautiful Lady Diana Rich, daughter to the Earl of Holland, as she was walking in her father's garden at Kensington, to take the fresh air before dinner, about eleven o'clock, being then very well, met with her own apparition, habit, and every thing, as in a looking-glass. About a month after, she died of the small-pox. And it is said that her sister, the Lady Isabella

\* Ludwig Lavater, *Of Ghostes and Sprites Walking by Nyght . . .* trans. R[obert] H[arrison] (London, 1572), p. 77.

Thynne, saw the like of herself also, before she died. This account I had from a person of honour.<sup>6</sup>

The verbal and situational parallels with the quotation from *Prometheus Unbound* are remarkable, although Shelley's personal acquaintance with the *Miscellanies* cannot be directly established.

A recrudescence of literary interest in this superstition may also be noted in the works of Sir Walter Scott, particularly in Note 10 to *Rob Roy*, published in 1817, and in Note 9 to *A Legend of Montrose*, in 1819. The importance of these two notes is increased when one observes that according to Mary Shelley's reading lists<sup>7</sup> Shelley read a number of Scott's novels, and further that *A Legend of Montrose* was published during the period that Shelley was working on *Prometheus Unbound*.<sup>8</sup> The *Montrose* note of 1819 is most important in this situation, because Scott quotes material which seems to bear on the Shelley crux. He begins this note entitled "Wraiths" with his own categorical statement:

A species of apparition, similar to what the Germans call a Double-Ganger, was believed in by the Celtic tribes, and is still considered as an emblem of misfortune or death. . . .<sup>9</sup>

This comment seems in keeping with the interpretation of the significance of confrontation quoted above from Aubrey. Scott then reproduces in the note a section from *The Secret Commonwealth*, by Robert Kirk, the famous clergyman of Aberfoyle who was believed to have been abducted by the fairy people:

"Some men of that exalted [second] sight, whether by art or nature, have told me they have seen at these meetings a double man, or the shape of some man in two places, that is a superterranean and a subterranean inhabitant perfectly resembling one another in all points, whom he, notwithstanding, could easily distinguish one from another by some secret tokens and operations, and so go speak to the man his neighbour and familiar, passing by the apparition or resemblance of him. They avouch that every element and different state of being have animals resembling those of another element, as there be fishes sometimes at sea resembling monks of late order in all their hoods and dresses, so as the Roman invention of good and bad daemons and guardian angels particularly assigned is called by them one ignorant mistake,

<sup>6</sup> John Aubrey, *Miscellanies upon Various Subjects*, 4th ed. (London, 1857), pp. 89-90.

<sup>7</sup> Reprinted in Newman Ivey White, *Shelley* (New York, 1940), II, 539-45.

<sup>8</sup> Mary W. Shelley, *Journal*, ed. Frederick L. Jones (Norman, Oklahoma, 1947), pp. 120, 124, 139, 217.

<sup>9</sup> Sir Walter Scott, *A Legend of Montrose* (New York, 1889), p. 359.

springing only from this original. They call this reflex man a co-walker, every way like the man, as a twin-brother and companion, haunting him as his shadow, as is oft seen and known among men (resembling the original) both before and after the original is dead, and was also often seen of old to enter a house by which the people knew that the person of that likeness was to visit them within a few days. This copy, echo, or living picture goes at last to his own herd. It accompanied [sic] that person so long and frequently for ends best known to itself, whether to guard him from the secret assault of some of its own folks, or only as an sportful ape to counterfeit all his actions."—Kirk's *Secret Commonwealth*, p. 3.\*

Here in these lines we find some resemblance to the situation described in *Prometheus Unbound* where Earth in effect gives notice of another "secret commonwealth" in the subterranean regions, and it may well be that in the quotation we have a portion of the raw material upon which Shelley's mind was operating during the composition of his lyrical drama, especially in view of the date of Scott's note with its reprinting of Kirk.

Sir Walter then quotes examples of folk-superstition concerning the meaning of ghostly confrontation by one's own double, drawn from Theophilus Insulanus' *Treatises on the Second Sight*, 1819. It will readily be seen that in both the cases detailed below, death ensued soon after the beholding of the *doppelgänger*:

"Barbara MacPherson, relict of the deceased Mr. Alexander MacLeod, late minister of St. Kilda, informed me the natives of that island have a particular kind of second sight, which is always a forerunner of their approaching end. Some months before they sicken they are haunted with an apparition, resembling themselves in all respects as to their person, features or clothing. This image, seemingly animated, walks with them in the field in broad daylight; and if they are employed in delving, harrowing, seed-sowing or any other occupation, they are at the same time mimicked by this ghostly visitant. My informer added further, that, having visited a sick person of the inhabitants, she had the curiosity to inquire of him, if at any time he had seen any resemblance of himself as above described; he answered in the affirmative, and told her that, to make further trial, as he was going out of his house in a morning, he put on straw-rope garters instead of those he formerly used, and having gone to the fields, his other self appeared in such garters. The conclusion was, the sick man died of that ailment, and he no longer questioned the truth of those remarkable presages."

"Margaret MacLeod, an honest woman advanced in years, informed me that, when she was a young woman in the family of Grishkirnish, a dairy-maid, who daily used to herd the calves in a park close to the house, observed, at different times, a woman resembling herself in shape and attire, walking

\* Ibid.

solitarily at no great distance from her, and being surprised at the apparition, to make further trial, she put the back part of her upper garment foremost, and anon the phantom was dressed in the same manner, which made her uneasy, believing it portended some fatal consequences to herself. In a short time thereafter she was seized with a fever, which brought her to her end, but before her sickness and on her deathbed, declared the second sight to severals." <sup>10</sup>

Shelley's interest in the occult and his apparent susceptibility to hallucinations were, of course, well established before 1819, and it is also possible that he could have become acquainted with the Celtic beliefs surrounding the *doppelgänger* during his residence in Wales and Ireland. The possession of such knowledge may in part explain his horror when, around June 20, 1822,

... He met his own figure walking on the terrace, and the phantasm demanded of him: "How long do you mean to be content?" <sup>11</sup>

Whatever the factual basis of this event, it proves at least Shelley's preoccupation with confrontation. Corroboration of the vision is given in Mary Shelley's letter to Maria Gisborne of 15 August 1822, in which Mary does not seem to have realized its possible significance for her husband. Her comment on the phantom's statement reads: "—no very terrific words & certainly not prophetic of what has occurred." <sup>12</sup> Shelley had been drowned on July 8.

The significance of the *doppelgänger* image in the drama may then be that it is a sign not of physical death, but rather of the impending destruction of an old order as the reign of Jupiter draws to its close. Shelley himself may have explained his method when he wrote in the introduction to *Prometheus Unbound*:

The imagery I have employed will be found, in many instances, to have been drawn from the operations of the human mind, or from those external actions by which they are expressed. . . . <sup>13</sup>

Temple University

MARGARET LOFTUS RANALD

Fordham University

RALPH ARTHUR RANALD

<sup>10</sup> Theophilus Insulanus [pseud. for ? M'Leod], "Rev. Mr. Fraser's Treatise on the Second Sight," *Treatises on the Second Sight*, 1763, Relations X and XXVII, as quoted in Scott, pp. 359-60.

<sup>11</sup> White, II, 368.

<sup>12</sup> *The Letters of Mary W. Shelley*, collected and edited by Frederick L. Jones (Norman, Oklahoma, 1944), Letter No. 144, I, 180.

<sup>13</sup> *Works*, p. 163.

## Walton's *Angler* and Donne: A Probable Allusion

Toward the beginning of *The Compleat Angler*, while Piscator and his companion, Viator, are stretching their legs up Tottenham Hill, philosophically discussing the merits of fishing, Walton has one of them mention in passing a theory of Biblical inspiration that sounds strangely modern. The application is somewhat far-fetched (he uses it to prove that both "meek Moses" and "the humble prophet Amos" were doubtless anglers since they alone of all the authors in the Old Testament mention fishhooks, which, he says, they would not have done unless they had used them), but the fundamental principle itself sounds as though it had been written fairly recently by someone interested in image clusters—Caroline Spurgeon, say, or Edward A. Armstrong, or Cleanth Brooks. It is ascribed to a certain "ingenious and learned man":

since I have your promise to hear me with patience, I will take a liberty to look back upon an observation that hath been made by an ingenious and learned man, who observes that God hath been pleased to allow those whom he himselfe hath appointed, to write his holy will in holy Writ, yet to express his will in such Metaphors as their former affections or practise had inclined them to; and he brings *Solomon* for an example, who before his conversion was remarkably amorous, and after by Gods appointment, writ that Love-Song betwixt God and his Church.<sup>1</sup>

Unfortunately, Walton neglected to footnote his source, and the identity of this ingenious man has remained unknown these past three hundred years. Readers and editors alike have passed over the section in silence—and perhaps with good reason, for the basic idea is a theological commonplace as old as the Church. Augustine, for example, believed that both God and man coöperated in the composition of scripture, God supplying the inner meaning or *sententia* (to use the terminology of Medieval exegesis) and man the outer form or *cortex*.<sup>2</sup> Jerome, however, is the one usually associated with the idea. In his prefaces to the various Old Testament prophets, he noted, for instance,

<sup>1</sup> *The Compleat Angler: A Facsimile Reprint of the First Edition*, ed. Richard Le Gallienne (London, 1896), p. 29. In order to get in another reference to fishing, later editions add at the end of the quotation: "(in which he sayes she had *Eyes like the fish-pools of Heshbon*)."

<sup>2</sup> *De Trinitate* I, 12. See also Charles Joseph Costello, *St. Augustine's Doctrine on the Inspiration and Canonicity of Scripture* (Washington, D. C., 1930), *passim*. For an excellent history of this and other theories of inspiration, see Augustinus Bea, *De Scripturae Sacrae Inspiratione Quaestiones Historicae et Dogmaticae* (Romae, 1935).

that Isaiah was an aristocrat, courtly of speech, with nothing of the hayseed about him: "in sermone suo disertus sit: quippe ut vir nobilis et urbanae eloquentiae, nec habens quidpiam in eloquio rusticitatis admistum." Jeremiah, on the other hand, wrote like a farmer: "Jeremias propheta . . . sermone quidem apud Hebraeos Isaia et Osee et quibusdam aliis prophetis videtur esse rusticior, sed sensibus par est: quippe qui eodem spiritu prophetaverit." Ezechiel was somewhere in between the two extremes: "Sermo ejus nec satis disertus, nec admodum rusticus est: sed ex utroque medie temperatus."<sup>3</sup> But Jerome has nothing to say about Solomon. He is probably the ultimate source, but Walton seems to have had someone else in mind, someone more immediate. And the trouble is that it could have been almost anyone. By the mid-seventeenth century the idea had become extremely popular except perhaps among hard-shell fundamentalists, who necessarily took their Bible straight, verbal inspiration and all. Most everyone else, however, was willing to allow it. The Jesuits in particular helped spread its popularity, and as codified by Bellarmine and Suarez it finally became the official position of the Church.<sup>4</sup> Walton, then, presumably could have found it almost anywhere; the possibilities are innumerable. Yet since he was not much of a scholar, it seems unlikely that he had some outlandish source in mind. Chances are, in fact, that he got it from the most obvious person of all, from his friend and pastor at Saint Dunstan's in the West, the man responsible for his spiritual welfare, the Reverend John Donne.

The idea is common in Donne; it occurs implicitly in a number of places throughout his work, but nowhere more clearly than in a sermon preached on December 14, 1617 at Denmark House before the Queen. The text is taken from *Proverbs* 8:17: "I love them that love me, and they that seek me early shall find me." Donne begins with a paraphrase of Jerome on the prophets, the *locus classicus*, but soon extends the idea: a covetous man would retain after his conversion the basic elements of his personality and begin to covet God; a voluptuous man would become a spiritual voluptuary. Similarly, Donne argues, getting down to the subject at hand,

Solomon, whose disposition was amorous, and excessive in the love of women, when he turn'd to God, he departed not utterly from his old phrase and language, but having put a new, and a spiritual tincture, and form and habit in all his thoughts, and words, he conveys all his loving approaches and

<sup>3</sup> *PL* 28, 771; 847; 939. For similar remarks on St. Paul, see *PL* 26, 478.

<sup>4</sup> A. Van Hove, *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, s. v. *Inspiration*.

applications to God, and all Gods gracious answers to his amorous soul, into songs, and Epithalamians, and meditations upon contracts, and marriages between God and his Church, and between God and his soul.\*

I am not certain exactly how Walton came across the idea in Donne. This particular passage was not published until 1661, eight years after the first edition of *The Compleat Angler*. He may have heard it when the sermon was first delivered at Denmark House; he may have seen it in manuscript while he was preparing the preface to the volume of *Fifty Sermons* in 1649; he may have come across it somewhere else in Donne's works. But however it was, it would have been the sort of thing not likely to be forgotten. Besides its own intrinsic merit as a piece of extraordinarily perceptive criticism, it is especially memorable as a dramatization of Donne himself. Behind the reference to Solomon there seems to stand the dim figure of that other Donne, not the Dean of St. Paul's, the preacher of the impassioned word of God, but the rakehell Jack Donne, who poured out his youth and his amorous soul in songs and sonnets. And that would have been particularly gratifying to Walton, who had done so much in his own biography to popularize the myth of Donne as the Augustine of his age, who had come into the City of God from Carthage, burning.

*Yale University*

FRANK MANLEY

### *Paradise Lost:* *Felix Culpa* and the Problem of Structure

In the twelfth book of *Paradise Lost*, Adam, now enlightened by Michael concerning the consequences of the Fall and the regeneration of Man through the sacrifice of the Son of God, exclaims:

O goodness infinite, goodness immense!  
That all this good of evil shall produce,  
And evil turn to good; more wonderful  
Then that by which creation first brought forth  
Light out of darkness! full of doubt I stand,  
Whether I should repent me now of sin  
By mee done and occasiond, or rejoyce

\* *XXVI Sermons* (London, 1661), pp. 257-258 (Potter and Simpson, I, 236-237); see also, *Fifty Sermons* (London, 1649), p. 386.

Much more, that much more good thereof shall spring,  
To God more glory, more good will to Men  
From God, and over wrauth grace shall abound

(XII, 470-78).

The parallel occurs in *Christian Doctrine* (Chapter XIV): "The Restoration of Man is the act whereby man, being delivered from sin and death by God the Father through Jesus Christ, is raised to a far more excellent state of grace and glory than that from which he had fallen.<sup>1</sup> These citations offer a beginning for any discussion of Milton's use—essential, it would seem—in *Paradise Lost* of the Paradox of the Fortunate Fall. Surprisingly perhaps, an awareness of the full significance of the Paradox in Milton's poem has been slow to develop, even since the publication of *Christian Doctrine*, and from the body of more recent criticism of this aspect of *Paradise Lost* the disagreement among the critics becomes most readily apparent.<sup>2</sup> This fact would ordinarily emphasize the power of the poem to evoke individual response to a complex structure of symbols and ideas, and in fact such is the case with much else in *Paradise Lost*, but the confusion caused by the meaning and structural function of the theme of *felix culpa* in the poem carries at least implications of a kind of failure on Milton's part. This would appear to be inevitable in terms of the nature and function of what we call didactic literature, that which contains a meaning that is ultimately ethical. In its intellectual content *Paradise Lost* is such a work, for the intention behind it and its ethical significance are Christian.

But this meaning, that Man shall be redeemed through the sacrifice of the Son of God, emerges from the poem in two ways—by the explicit statement of the poet, of God, and finally of Michael in the last two books; and by implication in the action which appears to

<sup>1</sup> *The Works of John Milton*, ed. Frank Allen Patterson *et al.* (New York, 1933), xv, 251.

<sup>2</sup> For more recent comment, see John Erskine, "The Theme of Death in *Paradise Lost*," *PMLA*, XXXII (1917), 573-82; Cecil A. Moore, "The Conclusion of *Paradise Lost*," *PMLA*, XXXVI (1921), 1-34; Allan H. Gilbert, "The Problem of Evil in *Paradise Lost*," *JEGP*, XXII (1923), 175-94; Denis Saurat, *Milton: Man and Thinker* (New York, 1925), p. 131; John Diekhoff, *Milton's Paradise Lost: A Commentary on the Argument* (New York, 1946), p. 131; B. Rajan, *Paradise Lost and the Seventeenth Century Reader* (New York, 1948), p. 45; Millicent Bell, "The Fallacy of the Fall in *Paradise Lost*," *PMLA*, LXVIII (1953), 863-83; *PMLA*, LXX (1955), 1187-97, 1203; Wayne Shumaker, "The Fallacy of the Fall in *Paradise Lost*," *PMLA*, LXX (1955), 1185-87, 1197-1202; H. V. S. Ogden, "The Crisis of *Paradise Lost* Reconsidered," *PQ*, XXXVI (1957), 1-19; William Madsen, "The Fortunate Fall in *Paradise Lost*," *MLN*, LXXIV (1959), 103-5.

bring Satan's victory. It is not my intention to present still another analysis of the action of *Paradise Lost*, but it is perhaps worthwhile to point out *again* several significant, though self-evident, aspects of the poem.

Through the first nine and a half books the method is dominantly that of irony, of which we—who are conditioned by the poet's assertion that Satanic "malice serv'd but to bring forth / Infinite goodness" (I, 217-18) and God's promise that "Man therefore shall find grace, / The other none" (III, 131-32)—are constantly aware. The balance, though delicate, is precisely maintained between the explicit action in the poem clearly leading to the Fall of Man and the implicit meaning that Man, though about to fall and to become helpless, shall be saved by the Son. We accept this and seek for the ironic implications in Satan's every act and speech, and though in time Satan triumphs over Man, actively and dramatically, we know that this triumph is temporary. This knowledge allows us to find much of the tension and therefore much of the power in the poem. What we grasp from the recognition of the irony gives emotional emphasis to the intellectual meaning of the work, of which the irony itself has been the principal instrument. In the ninth book occurs that moment toward which the action of the poem has been working. A kind of catharsis is achieved, and if anything remains of the central action of the Fall itself, it is merely to give dramatic emphasis, by Satan's return to hell in the tenth book, to the irony which has been implicit in the action leading to his apparent victory.<sup>3</sup>

In the last two books of *Paradise Lost* there is left, within the frame of the dramatic structure of the poem, only the dénouement, the passing of Adam and Eve from the Garden. But they must go forth with hope; at least a limited understanding on Adam's part of the nature of Man's redemption is essential for the fulfillment of divine purpose, so that an explicit and complete revelation to Adam of what is the intellectual meaning of the poem must follow. The promise of redemption is ironically implicit in Adam's misunderstanding of the nature of death in God's decree that if Adam and Eve transgress they must die (VII, 544), but Adam's mind must be cleared of this, and the significance of all that has happened, of which

<sup>3</sup> In terms of this function of the scene in hell, the observation of A. J. A. Waldock (*Paradise Lost and Its Critics* [Cambridge, England, 1947], pp. 91-92) is very much to the point, that the technique of the poet—to raise Satan to expectation of success "and then to dash him down"—is "exactly that of the comic cartoon."

we are already aware, must be brought to him. But in having Machael explain to Adam, the poet necessarily shifts his emphasis as he moves from the dramatic and emotional to the intellectual climax of the poem,<sup>4</sup> that point in the twelfth book at which Adam comprehends the way of Man's redemption and asks the paradoxical question. But the emotional force of the action and of our recognition of the ironic and real meaning of the poem has been spent, so that Adam's excited expression of happiness at the promise of redemption becomes, from the point of view of dramatic structure, an anticlimax. The belief that aesthetically the dramatic climax of the poem, at which Eve seeks one kind of knowledge, and the intellectual climax, at which Adam is given quite another kind of knowledge, *should be* reconciled has inspired much of the writing about what is ultimately the intellectual meaning of the poem, the Paradox of the Fortunate Fall. But the proposition that they *can be* reconciled—that Milton's subject, "Mans First Disobedience" (I, 1), can be made to coincide fully with his purpose, to "justifie the wayes of God to men" (I, 26)—lies at the heart of the matter.<sup>5</sup>

*Paradise Lost* is constructed upon two systems, one dramatic and the other intellectual. During the first nine and a half books the action is explicitly concerned with Milton's subject, working itself through the climax in the Fall to the scene of Satan's return to hell; hereafter, however, the intellectual system, which has been largely implied before, becomes overt, directly expressing Milton's purpose, and, except for the passing from the Garden, the action exists within the sequence of images that Michael sets before Adam. The first phase of the poem is anthropocentric, for the struggle between Satan and Man fills the foreground, but the second is theocentric and conceptual, concerned with the resolution of the conflict between the forces of Good and those of Evil. Here, quite simply, lies the basis of the problem of the hero of *Paradise Lost*, whether it is Satan or Adam (or in the place of Adam, the Son of God). In the first part of the poem Satan is, if not the protagonist, the center of attention, the instigator of action; in the second part Adam is the object of

\* It is significant that Raphael's account of the Creation and of the rebellion of Satan exists as part of both the dramatic and the intellectual development of the poem, but Michael's explanation is almost exclusively part of the intellectual.

<sup>5</sup> James Holly Hanford (*John Milton, Englishman* [New York, 1949], p. 201) does not think that they can be reconciled: "No defeat of Satan can outweigh the earlier manifestations of his transparent will; no promise to Adam of a moral Paradise within can counterbalance the tragic ruin of his innocence. The conclusion of *Paradise Lost* is a contradiction of its beginning."

instruction. Satan is nearly always active in the poem, just as Adam is almost consistently passive. But the poem itself is primarily a narrative, telling of the Fall of Man, and the movement of action toward the climax of the Fall carries its most obvious emotional force. Satan, the chief actor, must appear stronger than Adam, and in terms of the meaning of the poem, ironically implicit in the action, he must be a worthy opponent of the Deity; hence, as most critics have recognized, Satan becomes a towering figure and wins a kind of emotional support, even empathy perhaps, for the part that he plays.<sup>6</sup> But aside from this reaction there is that which springs from the other side of our ambivalence toward Satan and is achieved through our recognition of the ironic position that Satan fills. This develops emotional intensity to the point at which Satan's position is dramatized in the scene of his return to hell, in response to which our intellectual comprehension and emotional acceptance of the action become, for the moment, fused. The meaning of *Paradise Lost* is paradoxical, and to this point the method of revealing it has been that of irony. We accept the meaning largely because we feel that we know more than Satan does, and it is not until it is spelled out to Adam outside of the central structure of narrative and we must subject its paradox to logical analysis that it ceases to move us.<sup>7</sup>

That *Paradise Lost* is by intention a poem embodying a system of belief leading ultimately to an ethical position renders it a didactic work, for didacticism would seem to be first a matter of intention. But the didactic effects here are intellectual rather than dramatic. They demand that our emotional reaction to the story be subordinated to our intellectual response to the explicit assertion in the final books of the Paradox of the Fortunate Fall.<sup>8</sup> This we cannot do, for it involves repudiation, rather than subordination, of what we have felt during the first nine and a half books, so that the didactic aspect of *Paradise Lost*, as opposed to the dramatic aspect in this particular instance, is hardly successful.

<sup>6</sup> See Saurat, p. 219; Maud Bodkin, *Archetypal Patterns in Poetry* (New York, 1958), pp. 224-39.

<sup>7</sup> These conclusions at least recall what Cleanth Brooks (*The Well Wrought Urn* [New York, 1957], pp. 17-18) has asserted, specifically about the meaning of Donne's "The Canonization" but generally about "almost any insight important enough to warrant a great poem," that the only way open to the poet is that of paradox: "More direct methods may be tempting, but all of them enfeeble and distort what is to be said."

<sup>8</sup> Cf. the distinction made by E. M. W. Tillyard (*Milton* [London, 1949], pp. 257-88) between "the conscious meaning" and "the unconscious meaning" in *Paradise Lost*.

Apparently the intention of some who have written about the poem has been to make the didactic aspect successful, or—as in the case of Mrs. Bell's assertion that Adam and Eve are fallen from the start or Mr. Ogden's suggestion that Adam's enunciation of the Paradox is not to be taken as a serious expression of anything other than his own emotional state at the time—to make meaning primary though it would appear to be a meaning unlike what the author of *Christian Doctrine* intended in his poem. But the emotional acceptance of the meaning must emerge from the action, and this it does through irony, though only in part. In the action leading to the Fall of Man we foresee and emotionally anticipate the destruction of Satan; but only through the explanation of the poet, of God, and of Michael do we know of Man's redemption. The final Fall of Satan, ironically present in the account of the Fall of Man, does not carry with it as emotionally forceful the implication that Man shall be made regenerate.

*University of Pennsylvania*

WILLIAM H. MARSHALL

## Time and Mrs. Newsome's "Blue Message": A Reply to Leon Edel

In MLN for March 1958 Leon Edel opines: "But to argue, as Stallman does, that 'time is the all-consuming theme' of the novel [*The Ambassadors*] is to reckon indirectly with the theme that James himself announced—that of awareness, of 'live all you can' in the sense of seeing and feeling life, which is, indeed, not to measure it by the mere tick of the watch." Well, that is precisely what I stated in my MLN note for January 1957, which Edel is attacking. "Time is the mainspring theme of *The Ambassadors*—How to Live it." *How to Live It* subsumes the theme that James announced, the theme of Awareness—"live all you can." The theme of Awareness and the time-theme equate. I have dealt not only directly but exhaustively with both versions of these thematic imports in my MLN note and especially in my *Modern Fiction Studies* essay for Spring 1957: "'The Sacred Rage'—The Time-Theme in *The Ambassadors*."

As for identifying the unnamed article Mrs. Newsome's factory produces, Edel argues that "The answer to the unnamed object lies in James's artistic intention and in his sense of the comic, and it is

not to be found in a cataloguing of symbols. James from the first visioned his novels as a process of collaboration between writer and reader." True, but what kind of collaboration any author hopes for is a sensitive awareness by the reader of the significance and inter-relationship of every thing in the novel, for otherwise what quality has the "collaboration"? Says Edel of Miss Patricia Evan's notion that the unknown article is safety-matches: she "was quite right, *so far as her reading was concerned* [my italics]. . . . It was precisely that when she read the novel." For Edel's liberal imagination, collaboration amounts to nothing more exacting than a simple-minded reading of the author's book; the question of critical insight is irrelevant. For Edel, it does not matter what the conjectured Woollett article is, one conjecture being quite as valid as another. "And if E. M. Forster wants to imagine button-hooks he is equally right. This is what his collaborative reading of the story has placed in the book." Collaborative reading indeed! What have such whimsical conjectures as safety-matches or button-hooks *thematically* to do with *The Ambassadors*? "And if Stallman decides to research the matter by symbol-cataloguing, and discovers it is an alarm-clock he too is right, *not because of the symbols* [italics mine] but because he has latched onto the time-piece."

Edel, in claiming that any guessed-at-thing answers Strether's riddle, wholly ignores the specifications of the riddle. If *any* object answers the occasion, then it is no riddle. Secondly, unriddled it is no longer a riddle. Strether's riddle opens and closes the novel (Chapters I-III serving as Prologue to the narrative). Very simply then, the reason James did not divulge the article is that to name it would constitute a spoiling of the riddle motif *and* of the motif of doubt, of questioning and bafflement which the riddle itself reinforces and which Strether's plight exemplifies throughout the narrative. Other reasons include "the author's instinct everywhere for the indirect presentation of his main image." (Preface to *The Wings of the Dove*.) To identify the mysterious article strikes me as crucial to any critically informed reading of *The Ambassadors*. The identification of a time-piece—watch or clock—illuminates the whole story; reread the novel by that test.

The test of any critical reading is its usefulness. The test of any critic is likewise whether his interpretation returns us anew to the book which we readers had only superficially read. As with the novelist, so with the critic: the aim (to quote James) is "to express

fully, entirely, 'to pump the case gaspingly dry,' to squeeze out value to the last drop." The best kind of criticism is "the kind that springs from the liveliest experience." The critical challenge is "essentially nothing but the spirit of fine attention." "The critic's passion, like the story-teller's, is 'love of the special case,' and both are to be known by their power of observation and their boundless curiosity."<sup>1</sup> To unriddle Strether's riddle in the spirit of fine attention is to attain the liveliest experience of what *The Ambassadors* is really all about, and it was by "love of the special case" that I latched onto (as Edel puts it) *the* identity. No object other than clock or watch meets Strether's specifications, and no other object elicits the Time and Awareness theme of the book; only this—nothing else—elicits every possible shade of meaningful relationships. Said James: "No shade or implication but is worth saving, and fineness of truth is equivalent to the whole truth, and is equivalent moreover not as an accumulation of particles, but as a totality, as a group of relationships, not accidental but necessary."<sup>2</sup>

Edel's standpoint involves him in curious contradictions versus the Jamesian critical principles he seemingly espouses. *Contra* James's critical principles, Edel contends that "the laws of poetry do not apply to the laws of fiction"—as though James's novels do not manifest the infusion of the poetic use of language! In denying the Jamesian principle of the infusion of the poetic in prose fiction, that the laws of poetry do apply to the laws of fiction, and in ignoring the Jamesian avowed intentions of cross-relations radiating from "a compositional centre," the Jamesian "plea for correspondences," Edel exposes himself as a Jamesian scholar at odds with James's critical principles. He argues from the author's Avowed Intentions, with which he himself stands at odds. *Contra* the avowed intentions of James as artist and critic, Edel reads *The Ambassadors* literally, and *The Portrait of a Lady* also, as devoid of symbolism.

As for the time references in *The Ambassadors*, says Edel, "It seems to me they prove nothing more in this case than that people are concerned with mechanical time because they meet trains, keep engagements, go to the theatre and must arrange their daily lives with some method." True, "the passage of time is, after all, the concern of most novels," and in *The Ambassadors* it operates of course

<sup>1</sup> Quoted from *Henry James's Criticism*, by Morris Roberts (Harvard University Press, 1929), p. 58.

<sup>2</sup> Roberts, p. 67.

at that literal level. But time is also rendered symbolically—not solely to record literally the passage of time as in other nineteenth-century novels having mechanical time as their nominal concern. Nor are all Victorian novels devoid of symbolism; for Edel, however, *The Ambassadors* employs time only literally. "It is one thing, moreover, for novelists like Faulkner and Mann to use time symbolism consciously," says Edel—as though James were not one of the most conscious of all literary artists!—"and another for the Victorian novelist to use time as it figured in his daily life."

*Contra* Edel, time in *The Ambassadors* is rendered symbolically. The proof is that the temporal and the moral motifs are equated, the one being analogous to the other. Strether, I said, "is addicted to watching the clock lest he miss the train, and that's why he misses it." Missing the train ("Now I hear its faint, receding whistle miles down the line") equates with missing out on life. Missing the fleeting moment is metaphorically rendered by Strether's addiction to keeping an eye on his watch. In further proof that time-pieces are symbolically employed in *The Ambassadors*, I cite the following additional instance occurring in Chapter XVIII. This passage appears neither in my MLN note nor in my MFS essay.<sup>3</sup>

Having received Mrs. Newsome's cablegram, Strether, in order to keep it from being blown out the open window where it rests, keeps it "from blowing away by the superincumbent *weight* of his watch." In the relieved weight of his timepiece lies his burden, the burden of Strether's time-consciousness. With no watch on him, momentarily he is freed from time, disengaged from his addiction to watching the clock and from his compulsion to heed Mrs. Newsome's Blue Message, representing the temporal and moral rigidity of Mrs. Newsome's Program: Get Chad home *on time*! The fact that Strether's watch is here identified with Mrs. Newsome, with all that she represents, substantiates my theory that it is time-pieces that the Newsome factory produce, and in the identity of the watch with the Blue Message is established also the equation of the moral and temporal themes. On this account alone *The Ambassadors* stands exempt from Edel's claim that it is just another nineteenth-century novel in which time figures solely as mechanical, merely to clock the daily life of the hero.

*University of Connecticut*

R. W. STALLMAN

<sup>3</sup> Now recast in *The Houses That James Built* (my collected essays on modern fiction), Michigan State University Press, 1961.

## *The Waste Land* in *A Farewell to Arms*

In a recent interview<sup>1</sup> Ernest Hemingway listed at some length his literary forbears—ranging from Mark Twain through Gongora—and spoke in other connections of various influences. Among the names mentioned, that of T. S. Eliot is conspicuously absent, although the influence of Eliot has inevitably been pointed out by most Hemingway commentators. Drawing parallels between the world of the novel and the world of the poem, Philip Young has identified *The Sun Also Rises* as “Hemingway’s *Waste Land*,”<sup>2</sup> and he also notes Hemingway’s admission in *Death in the Afternoon* that he has learned from Eliot “to play with quotations.”<sup>3</sup> To the conclusions of Young and others, I would like to add the following piece of evidence, which would suggest perhaps that the world Eliot created in *The Waste Land* is so compelling, Hemingway was unable to escape its influence when confronted by the particularized twentieth-century waste land of his own making. And it is in his playing with quotations that Hemingway provides a clue to the pervasive influence of the Eliot poem.

The quotation from Andrew Marvell which occurs in Chapter XXIII of *A Farewell to Arms* achieves its significance from the context which makes it appropriate.

Down below on the street a motor car honked.  
“But at my back I always hear  
Time’s Wingéd chariot hurrying near,”  
I said.  
“I know that poem,” Catherine said. “It’s by Marvell.  
But it’s about a girl who wouldn’t live with a man.”

It is the sound of a motor car which brings the quotation to Henry’s mind, and the association is meaningful because it has already been established as such by Eliot in *The Waste Land*.

But at my back from time to time I hear  
The sound of horns and motors. . . .  
(III, 196-7)

The association of the sound and the Marvell lines is one which Hemingway could readily make, although this specific twentieth-century literary synapse would, of course, involve an impossible

<sup>1</sup> *The Paris Review*, 18, 60-89 (Spring 1958).

<sup>2</sup> Ernest Hemingway (New York: Rinehart & Co., 1952), pp. 59-60.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 154.

anachronism for Lt. Henry. Hemingway, however, heard the horn in an inner ear and made available to the modern reader the direct relevancy of the quotation to the situation of Frederick Henry and Catherine, two dwellers in the modern Waste Land.

The quotation is particularly revealing as it comes into Henry's mind in the tawdry hotel room where he and Catherine have taken temporary refuge, and the lines follow hard upon Catherine's unhappy reaction to their surroundings and situation: "I've never felt like a whore before." The lines from Eliot occur in *The Fire Sermon* section of the poem and introduce not only the world of Mrs. Porter and her daughter, but also the incident of the typist and the young man carbuncular. The implications, the contrasts, the comparisons are obvious, and by the use of the Marvell lines in a *context* already established in *The Waste Land*, Hemingway achieves in a masterfully economical stroke, a meaningful relationship between the situation of his lovers and the modern situation diagnosed by Eliot. The result is a deepening of meaning for the reader beyond the ironic contrast implied by Catherine, "But it's about a girl who wouldn't live with a man."

Perhaps Hemingway's failure to acknowledge his debt to Eliot is for modern readers an implicit recognition of the fact that in *The Waste Land* Eliot has created an inescapable mythic organization of materials which modern authors facing their own wastelands will inevitably hear at their backs from time to time.

*University of Washington*

DONNA GERSTENBERGER

## A Clever Tale in Early Spanish Prose

Seventeenth-century novelistic prose of Latin America utilizes a popular tale, the motif of which is familiar to many folklorists; yet it has been catalogued in none of the published indices of motifs. This theme, which figures principally in oral traditions, deals with the cleverness of the protagonists. Two authors of colonial Spanish works found the same story particularly applicable to strengthen the portrayal of their characters or to emphasize the didactic intent of their prose.

The simplest of the two versions appears in *De la naturaleza del*

*indio*, published first around 1650, by the Spanish prelate Juan de Palafox y Mendoza who was named Bishop of Puebla de los Angeles in Mexico in 1640 and Viceroy of New Spain in 1642.<sup>1</sup> In addition to his ecclesiastical and administrative duties, this devoted cleric became an ardent apologist for the Indian of the New World, continuing the zeal of the famed Apostle of the Indies, Bartolomé de las Casas, in his attempts to influence the Spanish crown to enforce more rigidly the laws protecting the native. The twenty-one chapters of the work in question discuss the admirable qualities of the Indians, with illustrative anecdotes extolling bravery, dexterity, alertness, patience, intelligence and deep sense of justice. Their astuteness is revealed in the following tale:

Caminando un indio y otro vecino español, entrabmos a caballo, acertaron a encontrarse en un páramo o soledad, y el rocio del vecino era muy malo y viejo, y el del indio muy bueno. Pidióle aquel hombre al indio que se le trocase; él lo reusó, por lo que perdía en ello. Pero como el uno trahía armas y el otro no las trahía, con la razón de poder, y con la jurisdicción de la fuerza, le quitó el caballo al indio, y pasando su silla a él, fué caminando, dejándole en su lugar al pobre indio el mal caballo. El indio volvió siguiendo el español, y pidiéndole que le diese su caballo, y el hombre negaba que se le hubiese quitado.

Llegaron con esta queja y pendencia al lugar, en donde el Alcalde mayor llamó a aquel hombre a instancia del indio; haciéndole traer allí el caballo, le preguntó por qué se le había quitado al indio. Respondió y juró que no se le había quitado, y que era falso cuanto decía aquel indio; porque aquel caballo era suyo y él le había criado en su casa desde que nació. El pobre indio juró también que se le había quitado y como no había más testigos ni probanzas . . . , y el uno poseía el caballo y el otro le pedía, dijo el Alcalde mayor al indio que tuviese paciencia, porque no constaba que aquel hombre le hubiese quitado el caballo.

El indio, viéndose sin recurso alguno, dijo al juez:

—Yo probaré que este caballo es mío; no es de este hombre.

Dijole que lo probase, y luego quitándose el indio la tilma que trahía, que es la que a ellos sirve de capa, cubrió la cabeza a su caballo que el otro le había quitado, y dijo al juez:

—Dile a este hombre, que pues él dice que ha criado este caballo, diga luego de cuál de los ojos es tuerto.

El hombre turbado con la súbita pregunta, en duda respondió:

—Del derecho.

<sup>1</sup> "De la naturaleza del indio," *Hijo pródigo*, VII (enero, 1945), 100-108; (marzo, 1945), 153-165. Palau y Dulcet suggests that this work was published secretly around 1650. He further lists a 1661 edition printed in Zaragoza, a Madrid printing in 1893, and a 1672 French translation published in Paris. (See Antonio Palau y Dulcet, *Manual del librero hispano-americano*, Barcelona, 1923-1927, VI, p. 16.)

de  
les  
on  
ric  
n-  
as  
re  
of  
is,  
ss,  
is  
on  
lo  
le  
as  
la  
o,  
do  
se  
or  
o,  
no  
el  
re  
ni  
de  
re  
0  
;  
n  
d,  
0  
8  
de  
de  
0  
;

Entonces el indio, descubriendo la cabeza del caballo, dijo:

—Pues no es tuerto.

Y pareció ser así, y se le volvió su caballo.

A more detailed account is found in an earlier work, the short title of which is *Historia de la monja alférez*, a supposed autobiography of Catalina de Erauso, published in Spain.<sup>2</sup> A 1646 manuscript is extant, but speculation points to a 1626 copy of the work, which narrates in picaresque fashion the adventures of the robust doña Catalina, who left the convent in Spain before taking final vows and spent the remainder of her life disguised as a man and engaging in battles, duels and gambling sprees in the New World.

Chapter XVII of this work includes the tale, elaborated with spirited dialogue, to relate one of the heroine's misadventures in Peru. Substituting herself for the Indian victim, and replacing the Spaniard with two peninsular soldiers, she writes:

Me estuve en Lima unos siete meses, ingeniándome allí lo mejor que pude. Compré un caballo, que me salió bueno y no caro, y me anduve en él unos pocos días, tratándome de partir para el Cuzco. Estando de partida, pasé un día por la plaza, vino a mí un alguacil y me dijo que me llamaba el señor alcalde, don Juan de Espinosa, caballero del Orden de Santiago. Llegué a su merced; estaban allí dos soldados, y así que llegué dijeron:

—Este es, señor. Este caballo es nuestro y nos ha faltado, y de ello daremos luego bastante información.

Rodeáronme ministros, y dijo el alcalde:

—¿Qué hemos de hacer en esto?

Yo, cogida de repente, no sabía qué decir; vacilante y confusa, parecía dilenciente, cuando se me ocurre de pronto quitarme la capa y le tapé con ella la cabeza al caballo, y dije:

—Señor, suplico a vuestra merced que estos caballeros digan cuál de los ojos le falta a este caballo, si el derecho o si el izquierdo. Que puede ser otro animal, y equivocarse estos caballeros.

—Dice bien; digan ustedes a un tiempo de cuál ojo es tuerto ese caballo, dijo el alcalde.

Ellos se quedaron confusos.

<sup>2</sup> The full title of the 1646 work is: *Vida y sucesos de la Monja Alférez o Alférez Catarina, Da. Catarina de Araujo, doncella natural de San Sebastián, Prov. de Guipúzcoa, escrita por ella misma en 18 de Setiembre de 1646, volviendo de las Indias a España en el Galeón San Josef, Capitán Andrés Otón, en la Flota de Nueva España, General D. Juan de Benavides, General de la Armada D. Tomás de Laraspuru que llegó a Cádiz en 18 de Noviembre de 1646*. For analysis of this manuscript and others of the same work which appeared in Spain and Spanish America between 1625 and 1653, see my unpublished dissertation (University of Michigan, 1956), "The Use of Novelistic Elements in Some Spanish American Prose Works of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries," 286-321.

—Díganlo ustedes a un tiempo, dijo el alcalde.  
—Del izquierdo, dijo el uno.  
—Del derecho; digo, del izquierdo, dijo el otro.  
A lo que dijo el alcalde:  
—Mala razón han dado ustedes y mal concordante.  
—Del izquierdo, del izquierdo decimos ambos, y no es mucho equivocarse, volvieron ellos, juntos, a decir.  
—Señor, aquí no hay prueba, porque uno dice uno, y otro, otro, dije yo.  
—No decimos sino una misma cosa: que es tuerto del ojo izquierdo, y eso iba yo a decir y me equivoqué sin querer; pero luego me enmendé, y digo que del izquierdo, dijo uno.  
Paróse el alcalde, y dije yo:  
—Señor, ¿qué me manda vuestra merced?  
—Que si no hay más prueba, se vaya usted con Dios a su viaje, dijo el alcalde.  
Entonces tiré de mi capa, y dije:  
—Pues vea vuestra merced cómo ni uno ni otro están en el caso, que mi caballo no es tuerto, sino sano.  
El alcalde se levantó y llegó al caballo y lo miró y dijo:  
—Monte usted y váyase con Dios.  
Y volviéndose a ellos, los prendió. Yo monté y me fui, y no supe en lo que paró aquello, porque me parti para el Cuzco.

The use of this tale by two Spanish writers suggests that it may have sprung from the rich folk literature of the Iberian peninsula. Suspicion is immediately cast upon the possible Arabic or Oriental origin of the theme, and the present-day student could hope to find it in one of the many collections of medieval Spanish *cuentos* or *exempla*. However, no existing index of these early Spanish narratives catalogues the motif.

Since both of these works were penned by authors living in the New World or describing experiences encountered there, one may conjecture that the origin of the motif lies within the popular tradition of the Latin American Indian. This is further suggested by the research of the Peruvian scholar, Dr. Efraín Morote Best, who has known the motif, both as a part of gypsy lore and as an element of the oral heritage of the Peruvian Indians. In the Andes it has been utilized, as it was in Mexico, to show the cleverness of the native in avoiding exploitation. Some Peruvian versions continue the tradition with the use of an Indian and a Spanish layman, while others reveal more serious social implications by substituting a Spanish cleric for the layman or soldiers.

However, this theory of Spanish American origin also becomes tenuous for two reasons: 1) the tale is not found in any of the

collections of South American Indian tales available for perusal, and 2) various reputable informants ascertain a familiarity with the theme in European traditions, other than Spanish, particularly German and Italian. Although Stith Thompson does not include the motif in his *Motif Index of Folk Literature*, he recognizes it, and concurs with this writer in the belief that it should be classified as an example of Cleverness in the Law Court (The Wise and the Foolish), under the subdivision classification of J1154, in which the witness is discredited by his inability to tell details.

It is not the intent here to prove the origin of the motif. It is rather to suggest that although the tale has been popular in European and Indian oral traditions, it was the Spaniards who first incorporated it into their literary prose productions.

*Parsons College*

WALTER D. KLINE

### *Cancionero de Baena No. 237: "Cativa muy triste"*

An early poem that deserves some consideration in the history of the development of Castilian lyric poetry is the "Cativa muy triste, desaventurada" that appears without rubric in the *Cancionero de Baena*.<sup>1</sup> This poem, which has escaped the notice of critics, is important primarily because of its intrinsic value in relation to its time and the fact that it is one of the earliest successful attempts to use the *decir* framework for strictly lyric expression,<sup>2</sup> and secondarily because it may be the work of Francisco Imperial. The poem could lend itself to a lengthy analysis in which the scholar would study the influence of the Galician-Portuguese lyric in the verbal expression and the feminine point of view, the reflection of the age in the poetic motifs and materials employed—the astrological reference ("Nacida en planeta e synno menguado"), the insistence on the role of fortune ("commo me touo fortuna guardado," "mouisse ventura por mal me faser," "ventura menguada," "ayrada ventura"), the concern with morals ("E nunca faciendo mal nin error") and the despair of the

<sup>1</sup> Ed. Eug. de Ochoa and P. J. Pidal (Madrid, 1851), No. 237. Facsimile ed. of the manuscript, N. Y. 1926.

<sup>2</sup> For full discussion of the structure of *decir* and *cantiga* consult Pierre Le Gentil, *La poésie lyrique espagnole et portugaise à la fin du moyen âge*, 2 vols. (Rennes, 1949-1953), especially vol. II.

triumph of justice and reason ("e non me valer justicia guissada, / nin buena rason que sea fermosa"), the consciousness of death ("que muerte me seria mejor allegada," "so cada dia a muerte venida")—and the possible contribution to the development of sentimental literature in Spain. The poem could furnish the literary critic with material for an essay on mediaeval technique in emotion portrayal, in sustaining lyricism in a long poem in heavy form, in combining smoothly such diverse elements as astrology, fortune, morals, justice, reason, death, and marriage and using them to increase the poignancy of sorrow and despair. The poem, in fine, does pique the curiosity of one who studies the poems attributed to Imperial by Baena in the section of the *Cancionero* devoted primarily to Imperial's work, and it is this curiosity that has led to the present investigation and study.

In view of the information brought to light by modern scholarship concerning the subject and Imperial's authorship of "Grant sonsiego e mansedumbre," selection No. 240 of the Ochoa-Pidal edition of the *Cancionero de Baena*,<sup>3</sup> the possibility of Imperial's authorship of "Cativa muy triste, desaventurada" becomes apparent. The two poems, of like topic, stand near each other in Baena's collection and are embedded in the section devoted to Imperial's compositions. Both poems seem to deal with the subject of Angelina de Grecia's captivity and consequent separation from her native land and people, although the lady herself is named only casually in "Grant sonsiego" and not at all in "Cativa muy triste." "Grant sonsiego," which seems to precede the other poem chronologically, is the poet's reaction to the lady's plight. In "Cativa muy triste" the poet has been so deeply moved by her distress, perhaps intensified by her marriage, that he puts himself completely in her place and speaks with her own lips. In "Grant sonsiego" he had merely quoted her laments. Such great pity for a fellow human being would be difficult to find at this period outside these two poems and perhaps the beginning of Imperial's "En dos setecientos" (*Cancionero de Baena*, No. 226).

Mercedes Gaibrois de Ballesteros has discovered a document concerning the presence of Angelina de Grecia in Seville in 1403, a time

<sup>3</sup> Ochoa-Pidal, op. cit., n. CLXII, p. 669; Erasmo Buceta, "El autor de la composición número 240 del 'Cancionero de Baena,' según Argote de Molina," *Revista de Filología Española*, XIII (1926), 376-377; A. T. [Antonio Tovar], "Un suspiro de doña Angelina de Grecia," *Correo Erudito*, I (1940), 328; M. G. de B. [Mercedes Gaibrois de Ballesteros], "Noticias del viaje de Angelina de Grecia," *Correo Erudito*, I (1940), 323-324; Rafael Lapesa, "Notas sobre Micer Francisco Imperial," *Nueva Revista de Filología Hispánica*, VII (1953), 337-351.

when Imperial could easily have been in the same city. Moreover, according to another document recently published by the same scholar,<sup>4</sup> Imperial was in any case in a position, as Vice Admiral of Castile, to be familiar with court matters. The news of the arrival of a person of the importance and reputed beauty of Princess Angelina would hardly have passed unnoticed by anyone concerned with court affairs, and most especially by a poet sensitive to feminine charms and emotions.<sup>5</sup> And it would not be unprecedented for one inspiration to engender two poems by the same poet, though it was not uncommon, either, for one topic to be treated by more than one author, as the series on Estrella Diana will indicate.<sup>6</sup> Although similarity of topic does not prove identity of authorship, it seems to be beyond a doubt that Imperial could have been the author of the poem in question.

The fact that "Cativa muy triste" is included in the section of the *Cancionero de Baena* in which most of Imperial's poems are collected may have some significance in the matter of authorship, since it was Baena's practice to gather together, as far as possible, the whole collection of a single poet.<sup>7</sup> Most exceptions to this practice are *respuestas* to *preguntas* or to provocative statements in another poem, or belong to a group of poems written for a special event, such as the birth of Juan II or the death of Enrique III. Anonymous poems usually appear between collections, some within them. It is quite possible that Baena expected the reader to take it for granted that unless otherwise stated, a poem within a collection was to be attributed to the author of the collection. The fact that Baena at least once in addition to No. 240 considered authorship obvious and therefore the use of a rubric unnecessary is clear in the case of Imperial's *respuesta* to Ferrant Peres de Gusman's *decir* on Estrella Diana,<sup>8</sup> as María Rosa Lida has shown in a detailed study of the two poems.<sup>9</sup>

If "Cativa muy triste, desaventurada" is by Imperial, it will help

<sup>4</sup> "El famoso poeta Micer Francisco Imperial fue vicealmirante de Castilla," *Correo Eruditio*, III (1943), 152-153.

<sup>5</sup> In addition to "Grant sonsiego," the (for the time) unusually delicate handling of Estrella Diana (*Canc. Baena*, 231) and particularly the opening of the famous poem on the birth of Juan II (*Canc. Baena* 226), in which Imperial shows sympathy in the suffering of the queen in childbirth.

<sup>6</sup> On Estrella Diana, see *Canc. Baena*, Nos. 231 ff.

<sup>7</sup> Nos. 241 and 242 are also included without rubric in the section and so may also be by Imperial.

<sup>8</sup> *Cancionero de Baena*, No. 232.

<sup>9</sup> "Un decir más de Francisco Imperial: Respuesta a Fernán Pérez de Guzmán," *Nueva Revista de Filología Hispánica*, I (1947), 170-177.

to justify the Marquis of Santillana's appraisal of Imperial's poetic work,<sup>10</sup> for it, more than any other work attributed to Imperial shows the poet sensitive to human suffering, though in the cumbersome poetic machinery of the time it is difficult for the poet to express his feelings adequately. To temper the effect of the bulk and the weight of the form, he borrows from the more delicate, though equally conventional, expression of the feminine love plaint of the Galician-Portuguese *cancioneiro* poetry of preceding centuries and adapts traditionally song material to *decir* form. In fact, one could apply to this author Santillana's remark concerning the work of his grandfather, Pero González de Mendoza: "Usó una manera de decir cantares."<sup>11</sup> The reality of the lady's situation—literal captivity—makes itself felt in spite of conventional style, and sets this poem apart from the figurative *prisionero* or *cárcel de amor* literature that was developing during the period and which this poem, on the surface, resembles.<sup>12</sup> The same reality distinguishes it, as well, from the *romance* fiction on the *malcasada* or *la bella mal maridada*<sup>13</sup> theme, of which there is a suggestion in such lines as "e troxo me a tiempo que fuese casada . . . con quien non sabe el bien conoscer" and in the last two strophes of the poem. The poet has been moved to forgo indulgences in the use of worldly knowledge, of learned reference, and if Imperial is the author, a golden opportunity for a display of familiarity with foreign languages.<sup>14</sup> The show of wit and learning so dear to the heart of the late mediaeval court poet, and particularly to Imperial, gives way here to concentration on a single emotion.

<sup>10</sup> "E asy por esto, como por ser tanto conoscidas e esparzidas a todas partes las sus obras, passaremos a Miger Francisco Imperial, al qual yo non llamaría dezidor o trobador, mas poeta; como sea cierto que si alguno en estas partes del Ocaso meresçio premio de aquella triunfal e laurea guirlanda, loando a todos los otros, este fue. Fizo al nasçimiento del rey, nuestro señor, aquel dezid: famoso:

En dos setegientos.

e muy muchas otras cosas graciosas e loables." (*Letter of the Marquis of Santillana to Don Peter, Constable of Portugal*, ed. Antonio R. Pastor and Edgar Prestage, Oxford, 1927, pp. 79-80). Santillana's enthusiasm for Imperial may have been in part warmed by the close political and probably friendly relationship of Imperial with Santillana's family: Imperial served as Vice-Admiral of Castile under Diego Hurtado de Mendoza, Santillana's father, who was Admiral (M. Gaibrois de Ballesteros, "El famoso poeta . . .", p. 152).

<sup>11</sup> Op. cit., p. 78.

<sup>12</sup> Compare themes and expression of such works as Macías, "Cativo de miña trystura" (*Canc. Baena*, No. 306), Diego de San Pedro, *Cárcel de amor*.

<sup>13</sup> For example, Wolf y Hofmann, *Primavera y flor de romances* (Berlin, 1856), II, 60.

<sup>14</sup> On foreign words in "Grant sonsiego" see A. T., "Un suspiro. . . ."

In short, "Catiua muy triste, desaventurada," whether by Imperial or another, is a rare early example of an attempt to create lyric poetry independent of musical form, of a Castilian poet's sustained lyric expression of pure emotion—human desolation resulting from social injustice—and as such deserves the recognition it has been denied as a consequence of its anonymity and relative inaccessibility as it lay buried in the *Cancionero de Baena*.

The poem is found on folio 79 of the facsimile copy of the *cancionero* manuscript. The script is clear and so offers little or no difficulty in the transcribing. The text is as follows:<sup>15</sup>

Catiua muy triste, desaventurada,  
nasçida en planeta e synno menguado,  
commo me touo fortuna guardado  
dolor e amargura tan apresurada,  
seyendo de niña en bienes criada,  
e nunca façiendo mal nin error,  
biuo cuytada en tanto dolor,  
que muerte me seria mejor allegada.

Mouiosse ventura por mal me faser,  
e troxo me a tienpo que fuese cassada,  
por mi peccado, ventura menguada,  
con quien non sabe el bien conoscer  
.....<sup>16</sup>  
e guarde con ella bondat acabada;  
deuria por ende yo ser mas loada,  
a do buen juysio devrie valer.

En carga non yago nin culpa meresco  
a Dios nin al mundo por cossa que he fecho;  
fasta oy tengo que ssea derecho  
por que tal culpa e pena meresco.  
E por fermosura non me engradesco,  
nin es mi senblanca en mas demostrado,<sup>17</sup>  
e sy lo contrario me fuer prouado,  
a pena de muerte por ello me ofresco.

;O triste catiua! ayrada ventura  
fue contra mi lo merescer,  
por me faser beuir en poder  
de quien nunca sopo conoscer mesura.  
E biuo por ello en tan grant tristura,

<sup>15</sup> I follow the punctuation of the Ochoa-Pidal edition.

<sup>16</sup> This line is left blank in the ms.

<sup>17</sup> I read the meaningless word *demostjdo* in the facs. ed.

syn<sup>18</sup> yo tener culpa nin merescimiento,  
mesquina por mengua de buen casamiento  
so e ssere jamas en tristura.

Mi vida sera jamas amargossa  
por me syn culpa en culpa culpada,  
e non me valer justicia guissada,  
nin buena rason que sea fermosa;  
ante, cuytada, en boz temerossa,  
so cada dia a muerte venida,  
ençima de lenguas o so mal trayda,  
porque mi vida ssera dolorossa.

*University of California*

DOROTHY CLOTELLE CLARKE

## Currency Inflation Reflected in Luis Vélez's de Guevara's *El embuste acreditado*

After it has become evident that the *embuste* which the *criado gracioso* Merlin had engineered convinced its victim, the Duchess Rosimunda, that she was actually flying through the spheres exposed to the heat of the sun, its perpetrator jubilantly exclaims:

¡Sacad tesoros! ¡Alerta!  
Que todo el oro y la plata  
es como esta patarata,  
que en mi embuste se concierta.<sup>1</sup>

In my note I searched in vain for the *tertium comparationis* between gold and silver on the one hand and the *embuste* on the other. Following a suggestion by Mrs. Charlotte D. Stern, I believe now that the point of comparison between *el oro y la plata*, i. e. currency, and Merlin's *embuste* is exactly the element of trickery. The joke implies that the money in circulation is nothing but a *patarata*, nonsense concretized in a fraud (*embuste*). The fraud is the devaluated *vellón*.

"In 1599 Philip III, maintaining that the silver ingredient of *vellón* was useless, authorized the coinage of *vellón* of pure copper. In *cuartos* and *ochavos* 140 maravedís were struck from a mark." After that year *vellón* was devaluated no less than four times more,

<sup>18</sup> The facs. ed. has *sy*.

<sup>1</sup> Lines 1843-1846 of my edition, *Colección Filológica*, XII (Universidad de Granada, 1956).

viz. on June 13, 1602; September 18, 1603; in 1617, and on March 13, 1621.

We are particularly interested in the events of the year 1617. On July 3, 1617, the king, after having promised on November 22, 1608, not to coin additional vellon, saw himself forced to petition the Cortes to be released from this promise. The Cortes granted the request on July 6, and on July 17 the Procuradores gave their consent with some restrictions. Finally, on September 30, the royal *cédula* authorized the issue of new vellon. Yet, "the revival of the coinage of vellon proved sufficiently unpopular to arouse the opposition of the Cortes" and eventually induced the Crown in 1619 to commit itself "to refrain from minting vellon of any kind for any purpose during the next twenty years and subsequently to coin only vellon containing the mixture of silver required by law."<sup>2</sup>

Our reason to believe that the Vélez passage refers to the inflationary measures of 1617 and not to any of the others (all chronologically possible) is that on literary and metrical grounds we have proposed<sup>3</sup> the years 1615-1618, possibly 1617-1618, as the most likely date of composition. If the interpretation of Merlin's ironic remark is correct, it would strengthen considerably the probability of the conjectured years 1617-1618. One could even narrow down the date between the second half of July and November 1, 1617. Merlin's *redondilla*, then, would be a reflection of the unpopularity of the revived coinage of vellon.

*University of Pennsylvania*

ARNOLD G. REICHENBERGER

## The Friendship and Enmity Between Quevedo and Juan de Jáuregui

Between 1620 and the date of his death in 1641, the Spanish poet and painter Juan de Jáuregui participated in several acrimonious

<sup>2</sup> See Earl J. Hamilton, *American Treasure and the Price Revolution in Spain, 1501-1650*. Harvard Economic Studies, XLIII (Cambridge, Mass., 1943), pp. 74-79; the quotations are on pp. 75 and 78; the wording of the text (pp. 77-78) is freely used in this paragraph. Many years before 1617, the measures of 1603 already had "evoked bitter criticism from the kingdom" (p. 76), and after 1606 "aroused public opinion prevented significant inflation in the decade following 1606" (p. 77).

<sup>3</sup> Ed. cit., pp. 67-80; particularly p. 79.

literary polemics. In studying the rôle of Lope de Vega in some of these controversies, Juan Millé y Giménez has shown not only that the personal relationship between Lope and Jáuregui varied from warm friendship to sharp enmity, but that today no more than the bare outlines of these fluctuations are known.<sup>1</sup>

It has hitherto been believed that Francisco de Quevedo and Jáuregui were generally on very bad terms. Quevedo ridiculed Jáuregui in his satirical essay *La Perinola* (1632), and Jáuregui attacked Quevedo's *La cuna y la sepultura* (1634) in a bitter play entitled *El retraido* (1634-1635), to which Quevedo seems to have replied in kind. During the heated political controversy with France in 1635, Quevedo published his *Carta a Luis XIII* decrying the sack of Tirlemont by the French, and Jáuregui replied with a *Memorial al Rey nuestro señor*.<sup>2</sup> In fact, I know of no one who has questioned Jordán de Urries' summation of the relationship between Quevedo and Jáuregui: "Entre todos los escritores contemporáneos suyos, a ninguno profesó Jáuregui tanta enemistad ni combatió con tanta saña como al más docto y singular de todos ellos, D. Francisco de Quevedo" (p. 47). But in spite of this amply documented enmity between the two writers, it now appears that they were at one time on fairly good terms, and it may be that their relationship varied from friendship to enmity much as did that of Jáuregui and Lope de Vega.

The publication of Jáuregui's *Discurso poético* in 1624 aroused considerable comment in Madrid, much of it unfavorable. Among the poems and essays in which he was attacked is the following sonnet, which satirizes the conflict in poetics between Jáuregui's gongoristic *Orfeo* (Madrid, 1624) and his anti-gongoristic *Discurso*:

Tú, que del triunvirato de penates  
lo greguizante en tu *Discurso* indicas,

<sup>1</sup> "Jáuregui y Lope," *Boletín de la Biblioteca de Menéndez Pelayo*, VIII (1926), 126-136; reprinted with additions in Millé's *Estudios de literatura española* (La Plata, 1928), pp. 229-245. Page references in the present article are to the enlarged 1928 text.

<sup>2</sup> On Jáuregui, see José Jordán de Urries y Azara, *Biografía y estudio crítico de Jáuregui* (Madrid, 1899), pp. 48, 71 (on *El retraido*), and 49, 74 (on the *Memorial*). On Quevedo, see his *Obras completas en prosa*, ed. Luis Astrana Marín (Madrid, 1945), p. 845, col. a and p. 1663, col. b (on *La Perinola*), p. 1763b (on the *Memorial*), and p. 1826b, n. 2 (on Quevedo's reply to *El retraido*). Both the *Memorial* and *El retraido* are printed in Quevedo, *Obras completas: obras en verso*, ed. Luis Astrana Marín (Madrid, 1943), pp. 1047 and 1064 respectively, but there is a more reliable edition of *El retraido* in Jordán de Urries' *Biografía*, p. 180. Astrana Marín's editions are hereinafter cited as *Prosa*, *Astrana*, and *Verso*, *Astrana*.

y al nombre neutro el femenino aplicas,  
pedante preceptor de disparates,  
poeta con albarda y acicates,  
que a ti te matas y a los otros picas,  
pecador en lo mismo que predicas,  
taladro universal de los orates,  
¿qué gramática enseñas a muchachos,  
que tal deidad rumí de Apolo adquieres?  
Humillate, sibila con mostachos.  
Vergajo de las musas, ¿qué nos quieres?  
Declárate en las hembras o en los machos,  
que inculto y culto hermafrodita eres.\*

This poem has been tentatively attributed to Quevedo by Luis Astrana Marín, who classifies it as "de probable autenticidad," and explains the basis for this opinion as follows: "Aparece como anónimo en muchos manuscritos del tiempo, pero el estilo es pintiparado al de Quevedo. . . . Data de 1624" (*Verso*, Astrana, p. 737b, n. 1). The date assigned is of course no more than a likely conjecture based on the date of publication of the *Discurso*. Of the "many manuscripts" mentioned, Astrana cites only two: MS 152 of the Biblioteca de Menéndez Pelayo, and a text published without attribution by Jordán de Urries (p. 39). In both of these sources the sonnet is undated and anonymous.

The remark about the style of the poem is at best a vague generalization about an author whose style is not yet widely considered as clearly defined.\* Similar statements by Astrana have met with sharp criticism from such scholars as Américo Castro ("excesivamente generoso en atribuciones a Quevedo"), and José Manuel Blecua ("[Astrana] le ha atribuido poemas que don Francisco jamás soñó en escribir").<sup>5</sup> Finally, there is a curious conflict between this attribution and another statement by Astrana to the effect that the enmity between Quevedo and Jáuregui did not arise until 1632: "Vino la enemistad . . . porque el gran poeta [Quevedo], al cerrar contra sus adversarios en *La Perinola* (1632), donde no perdonó ni aun a aquéllos

\* *Verso*, Astrana, p. 737b.

<sup>4</sup> On the lack of such a definition, see Amédée Mas, *La caricature de la femme, du mariage, et de l'amour dans l'œuvre de Quevedo* (Paris, 1957), p. 144.

<sup>5</sup> Castro, "Algunas publicaciones sobre Quevedo," *Revista de Filología Española*, xxI (1934), 178. Blecua, "Un ejemplo de dificultades: el Memorial 'Católica, sacra, real Magestad,'" *Nueva Revista de Filología Hispánica*, VIII (1954), 156. Further comment on Astrana's work may be seen in an excellent article by Juan Antonio Tamayo, "El texto de los Sueños," *Boletín de la Biblioteca de Menéndez Pelayo*, xxI (1945), 456-493.

que le habían elogiado, citó en tan terrible diatriba a Jáuregui, aunque de pasada, con evidente desdén y mofa" (*Prosa, Astrana*, p. 1663b, n.).

In conclusion, the attribution to Quevedo of the satirical sonnet quoted above is open to serious question, and is therefore insufficient to justify the unqualified inclusion of the poem in the history of the personal relationship between Quevedo and Jáuregui.

In the decade of the 1620's, Jáuregui held a position in Madrid as an official censor of books for the Inquisition. Among the manuscripts which he certified for publication were works by Miguel Botello de Carvallo, Pedro Arias Pérez, Alonso de Castillo Solorzano, Gonzalo Correas, and at least three by Lope de Vega.<sup>6</sup> He also examined Quevedo's *Política de Dios*, and his certificate of approval appeared in a hitherto unknown edition of the *Política* published in Madrid in 1628. No copy of this edition is now known to exist, but its preliminaries were reprinted in another equally neglected edition published in Salamanca by Juan Fernández in 1629.<sup>7</sup> In the Salamanca edition, Jáuregui's certificate appears as follows:

#### Aprobación

Por mandado de vuestra Alteza he visto este libro, en que no ay cosa contraria a la santa fe católica y buenas costumbres. El ingenio, estilo y doctrina del autor es grande, como se descubre en la materia del, donde hallarán los potentados de la tierra y sus consejeros guía para sus acciones según lo que Christo nuestro redemptor nos enseña por sus sagrados euágelistas. Y así mi parecer es, vuestra Alteza deue dar licencia para que se imprima. Fecha en Madrid, a veinte y seis de Septiembre, del año M. DC. XXVII.

D. Juan de Jáurigui  
Consultor del Santo Oficio

As in the case of the certificates which Jáuregui wrote for Lope's books, this document indicates that in 1627 Quevedo and Jáuregui were on good terms. The contrast between this friendship and their

<sup>6</sup> On Botello, Arias Pérez and Castillo Solorzano, see Cristóbal Pérez Pastor, *Bibliografía madrileña* (Madrid, 1907), III, 7a, 123b, and 265a. On Correas, the *Arte de la lengua castellana*, ed. Emilio Alarcos García (Madrid, 1954), p. 7 (*Revista de Filología Española*, Anejo LVI). On Lope, see Millé's article, cited above in note 1, pp. 243-244.

<sup>7</sup> Full bibliographical descriptions and textual analyses of these editions may be seen in my book, *The Sources of the Text of Quevedo's "Política de Dios"* (New York, Modern Language Association, 1959), pp. 59-61, 70, 107-108. Jáuregui's certificate occupies folios [8v-9r] of the Salamanca edition, which is known in two copies, one in the Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris, and the other in my possession.

<sup>8</sup> In the text, 'fanta' (confusion of the letter *f* with the long *s*).

subsequent enmity may be seen clearly in the sarcastic remarks which Jáuregui later made about the *Política de Dios* in *El retraido*:

*Censor:* Sabré apuntar algunas notas, y esperar que me enseñen los sabios de vuestra familia, aunque holgaría más discurriésemos sobre otros escritos del mismo [Quevedo], especialmente la que llama *Política de Dios*, que contiene perniciosa doctrina, no veneración al Rey, ni al Pontífice, ni a los Apóstoles, ni a la Virgen Santísima, ni a Jesucristo. Y porque muchos del siglo ignorante no reconocen este escándalo, me ofreciera a probarlo habiendo ocasión.\*

A second passage reads as follows:

*Libro:* También al Angel de la Guarda hace [Quevedo] su oración.

*Censor:* Ha hecho infinitas en sus libros a todos los ángeles que cayeron, y hoy le da esa de barato a alguno de arriba. Aun en el título de su *Política* puso luego a *Satanás* junto a *Cristo*.

In conclusion, it is clear that the sharp enmity between Quevedo and Jáuregui was preceded by a period of friendship which included the year 1627. Unfortunately neither this friendship in 1627 nor the satirical sonnet quoted above is of much help in determining the nature of their feelings towards each other in 1624: as in the case of Lope and Jáuregui, we know only the bare outlines of a long and varied personal relationship.

*University of Illinois*

JAMES O. CROSBY

## Denial, Affirmation, and Escape in the Wager and *Hexenkueche* Scenes of Goethe's *Faust*<sup>1</sup>

The antics of the apes that introduce the *Hexenküche* manifest a discontinuity and irrationality that have caused most commentators to regard them as an interlude with little relation to, or significance for, the drama as a whole. Since, however, these "Katzengeister"

\* This passage and the following one are taken from Jordán de Urries, *Biografía*, pp. 108-181 (an edition made from the autograph MS). At the time Jordán de Urries wrote, he was unable to locate a copy of the first edition of *El retraido* (Barcelona, Sebastián de Cormellas, 1635); today, I know of at least one, which is in my possession.

<sup>1</sup> Read, in slightly different form, at the annual meeting of the South Atlantic Modern Language Association in Augusta, Georgia, November 6 to 8, 1958.

(2484) are clearly spirits from Mephisto's realm who have invaded or assumed simian form, their quasi-nonsense is not, in my opinion, mere comic relief, but a diabolically debased and negative parody of ideas and motifs that occur elsewhere in the drama.

Let us first consider the father-ape's curious admonition to his young ones playing with a glass ball (2402 ff.):

Das ist die Welt:  
sie steigt und fällt  
und rollt beständig;  
sie klingt wie Glas,  
—wie bald bricht das!—  
ist hohl inwendig.  
Hier glänzt sie sehr  
und hier noch mehr.  
—Ich bin lebendig!—  
Mein lieber Sohn,  
halt dich davon!  
Du musst sterben!  
Sie ist von Ton:  
es gibt Scherben!

On the meaning of this passage, Vischer,<sup>2</sup> Loeper,<sup>3</sup> Schmidt,<sup>4</sup> Hefele,<sup>5</sup> Rickert,<sup>6</sup> Trunz,<sup>7</sup> Enright,<sup>8</sup> Böhm,<sup>9</sup> Beutler,<sup>10</sup> Daur,<sup>11</sup> and Roos<sup>12</sup> are silent. Witkowski,<sup>13</sup> Friedrich,<sup>14</sup> Buchwald,<sup>15</sup> and Heffner, Rehder, and Twaddell<sup>16</sup> dismiss the speech as nonsense, while Petsch<sup>17</sup> considers it half-nonsense. Düntzer,<sup>18</sup> Kuno Fischer,<sup>19</sup> Trendelenburg,<sup>20</sup> and Endres<sup>21</sup> regard it as a seriously meant warning of the

<sup>2</sup> F. Th. Vischer, *Goethes Faust. Neue Beiträge zur Kritik des Gedichts* (1875).

<sup>3</sup> G. v. Loeper, *Goethes Faust* (1879).

<sup>4</sup> E. Schmidt, *Goethes Werke in sechs Bänden* (1910, 1925), I.

<sup>5</sup> H. Hefele, *Goethes Faust* (Stuttgart, 1931).

<sup>6</sup> H. Rickert, *Goethes Faust* (Tübingen, 1932).

<sup>7</sup> Erich Trunz, *Goethes Werke* (Hamburg, 1949), III.

<sup>8</sup> D. J. Enright, *Commentary on Goethe's Faust* (1949).

<sup>9</sup> W. Böhm, *Goethes Faust in neuer Deutung* (Cologne, 1949).

<sup>10</sup> E. Beutler, *Faust und Urfaust* (Wiesbaden, 1953).

<sup>11</sup> A. Daur, *Faust und der Teufel* (Heidelberg, 1950).

<sup>12</sup> C. Roos, *Faust Problemer* (Copenhagen, 1941).

<sup>13</sup> G. Witkowski, *Goethes Faust* (9th ed. Leiden, 1936), II, 237.

<sup>14</sup> Th. Friedrich, *Goethes Faust* (3rd ed., 1939), p. 186.

<sup>15</sup> R. Buchwald, *Führer durch Goethes Faustdichtung* (3rd ed., 1949), p. 122.

<sup>16</sup> R. M. S. Heffner, H. Rehder, W. F. Twaddell, *Goethes Faust* (Boston, 1954-55), I, 381.

<sup>17</sup> R. Petsch, *Goethes Faust* (Leipzig, 1923), p. 569.

<sup>18</sup> H. Düntzer, *Goethes Faust* (7th ed., 1909), pp. 147 f.

<sup>19</sup> K. Fischer, *Goethes Faust* (Heidelberg, 1913), pp. 438 f.

<sup>20</sup> A. Trendelenburg, *Goethes Faust* (Berlin-Leipzig, 1922), I, 320.

<sup>21</sup> F. C. Endres, *Goethes Faust* (Basel, 1949), I, 148.

deception and transiency of the world, while Baumgart,<sup>22</sup> Minor,<sup>23</sup> Schröer,<sup>24</sup> Traumann,<sup>25</sup> and Ebering<sup>26</sup> interpret it as a malicious mockery of clerical other-worldliness—"die scheinbare Verneinung der Welt als hohl und leer."<sup>27</sup>

Apparently no one has observed that the speech sounds like a negative echo of the spirit chorus that had answered Faust's all-inclusive curse in the wager scene (1607 ff.):

Weh! weh!  
Du hast sie zerstört,  
die schöne Welt,  
mit mächtiger Faust;  
sie stürzt, sie zerfällt!  
Ein Halbgott hat sie zerschlagen!  
Wir tragen  
die Trümmern ins Nichts hinüber  
und klagen  
über die verlorne Schöne.  
Mächtiger  
der Erdensöhne,  
prächtiger  
baue sie wieder!  
In deinem Busen baue sie auf!  
Neuen Lebenslauf  
beginne  
mit hellem Sinne!  
Und neue Lieder  
tönen darauf!

Both passages deal with the fragility of the "world"—i.e. of earthly life. Moreover, the "aping" of the spirit chorus by the ape-spirit extends to actual verbal echoes: "Scherben" for "Trümmern"; "Das ist die Welt:/ sie steigt und fällt" for "Die schöne Welt! / . . . sie stürzt, sie zerfällt!"

Yet for all their outward similarity, the two passages are related to one another as are the positive and negative of a picture. The *Geisterchor* places the reality and value of life not in the external world but in the mind of the individual. The ape-spirit sees unreality as part of life itself: though the world seems real ("Hier glänzt sie

<sup>22</sup> H. Baumgart, *Goethes Faust als einheitliche Dichtung* (Königsberg, 1893), I, 295 ff.

<sup>23</sup> J. Minor, *Goethes Faust* (Stuttgart, 1901), I, 341.

<sup>24</sup> K. J. Schröer, *Goethes Faust* (1907), I, 156 f.

<sup>25</sup> E. Traumann, *Goethes Faust* (2nd ed. Munich, 1919), I, 319.

<sup>26</sup> E. Ebering, *Goethes Faust* (Berlin, 1934), p. 217.

<sup>27</sup> Quoted from Baumgart (see Note 22).

sehr") and affirms its own reality ("Ich bin lebendig!"),<sup>28</sup> it is really a delusion ("ist hohl inwendig"), whatever our attitude toward it may be.

If the ape's flat nihilism constitutes a kind of negative parody of the affirmative *Geisterchor*, it is at the same time a direct parody of the *Fluchrede* which, it will be remembered, immediately precedes the *Geisterchor* and to which the latter is a response. The tragic dignity of Faust's outcry: "Verflucht das Blenden der Erscheinung, / die sich an unsre Sinne drängt" (1593 f.) is debased into a platitudinous warning of the deceptive reality of the world.

Unable to overcome his overpowering sense of the impermanence and emptiness of human life, Faust seeks escape by a plunge into life's very meaninglessness, into unanalyzed sensation. Demanding "Speise, die nicht sättigt" and "rotes Gold, das ohne Rast / Quecksilber gleich, dir in der Hand zerrinnt" (1678 f.), Faust cries (1754 f.):

Stürzen wir uns in das Rauschen der Zeit,  
Ins Rollen der Begebenheit!

A parodic counterpart of this escape motif may be found in the *Hexenküche* in a passage immediately preceding the "Das ist die Welt" speech. Leaving his mate and young by the kettle, the male ape approaches Mephisto with the words (2394 ff.):

O würfle nur gleich  
und mache mich reich  
und lass mich gewinnen!  
Gar schlecht ist's bestellt,  
und wär' ich bei Geld,  
so wär' ich bei Sinnen.

Like the mercurial "rotes Gold" demanded by Faust, the easily-won money craved by the ape might not, to be sure, give value to life, but it could help one forget life's meaninglessness.

Let us return for a moment to the spirit chorus of the wager scene. We have shown that it is parodied *negatively* by the superficially similar "Das ist die Welt" passage in the *Hexenküche*, whose tone of denial really corresponds to Faust's curse. Can we find in the

<sup>28</sup> In assuming that the ape quotes the world in Line 2410 I follow Schröer (Note 24) and Trendelenburg (Note 20) and disagree with Minor (Note 23), Ebering (Note 26), and Düntzer (Note 18), who think the ape is asserting that he himself is alive.

*Hexenküche* a direct parallel to the affirmation of life expressed by the spirits that respond to Faust's curse?

A parallel exists, though this time not a parodic one, in Faust's utter absorption in the vision of ultimate earthly loveliness revealed to him by the magic mirror. Here, at last, is a value Faust can affirm without reservation, an experience that acts on him with the force of something absolute and unchanging.

Thus the three motifs of denial, affirmation, and escape in the wager scene are repeated in the *Hexenküche*, though in different order and in partly parodic form. In the wager scene it is Faust who denies and escapes and the spirits who affirm. The roles are reversed in the *Hexenküche*: here it is the ape-spirit that seeks escape in wealth, then denies the world, while it is Faust who affirms feminine beauty as an earthly absolute, an "Inbegriff von allen Himmeln" (2439). In so doing, he has begun the reconstruction of "die schöne Welt" urged on him by the spirit chorus:

Baue sie wieder,  
in deinem Busen baue sie auf!

The recognition that the wager scene's triple motif-pattern of denial, affirmation, and escape is repeated in the first half of the *Hexenküche* not only reveals deeper meaning in the alleged nonsense of the apes, but also lays bare the underlying connection of apparently discontinuous passages within the *Hexenküche* itself. The apes speeches of escape (2394-2399) and denial (2402-2415) are seen to be related both to each other and to Faust's affirmation of absolute beauty as revealed in the mirror.

*University of South Carolina*

DOUGLAS F. BUB

## The Genesis of an Abstract Poem: A Note on August Stramm

The reader of modern German poetry will all too often encounter impersonal and, as it seems, unrelated statements that are difficult to interpret. Most present day forms of poetic diction had already been used in Expressionism; August Stramm's poem "Werben," for

example, were it not for its title, would hardly suggest that it deals with Man's vain struggle in pleading for Woman's love.<sup>1</sup>

Werben

Geheimnis bogt das Tor  
Erde Himmel  
harren!  
Harren!  
Auf schließt dein Blick!  
Blend  
wirrt und greift  
und tastet  
Krampf in leeren Händen.  
Dein Lächeln wehrt.  
Verschlossen blickt das Tor.  
Mein Harren harrt  
und  
Gott und Himmel pochen!

There can be no doubt that the obscure passages were intended by the author; they form part of a design in which the vague suggestions of unrelated images are to demand the reader's special attention, because they—and not the obvious statements—carry the hidden meaning which is the poet's main concern. "Werben" is one of the very few poems by Stramm of which earlier versions are extant, and among these it is the most revolutionary as to structure and imagery. A study of its genesis will not only show what linguistic method Stramm employed when writing abstract poetry, but furthermore may demonstrate how ideas are transformed and deformed into the peculiar word patterns of "Sturmkunst," the earliest form of pure poetry in Germany.

The following, being the oldest of the unpublished versions, is little more than an awkward variation of the theme: Woman as the temple of life's mysteries; but in a highly interesting manner it shows the poet's attempt to probe a variety of perspectives of this theme:

Du stellst dich vor jedes Geheimnis / als Tor ich schließe dich /  
auf! / Du schließt dich auf / Du verdeckst es / Voller Geheimnisse /  
Du das einzige Geheimnis / mir, das alle andern / erschließt / Du  
bist das Geheimnis meiner / Welt / Du erschließt mir die Welt / Du  
bist der Schlüssel zur Welt / Mein Gott spricht / aus deinem Mund /  
Du bist der Tempel in dem / mein Gott wohnt.

Besides their obvious erotic reference, the recurring symbols *gate*,

<sup>1</sup> First published in "Der Sturm," vol. v, 15/16, November 1914.

*key, temple* clearly express a religious meaning: divine revelation and union with God depend on love, as mediated through Woman. The development of the key image is typical of this transformation of erotic statements into what may be called the language of a mystic, the previous "I open you" is answered by "You are the key to the world." It appears as if the poet was searching for a comprehensive sentence which, as a suitable combination of words, would afford the basis for linguistic and speculative development.

The second draft, which incorporates several versions, has been subdivided in order to facilitate the analysis. Thus the composition will consist of three sections which in turn develop the theme "Werben" as a siege of the temple:

I Vor dem Geheimnis bogest du das Tor

Du schließt die Welt / Durch dich gehen alle Rätsel / (Eingang) /

in das hineingehn alle Rätsel / herrlich schickt die Welt alle Rätsel /

Du schließest auf

Und

Läßt die Rätsel eingehn

IIa Ich harre davor (hart) atemlos bang / (Hart) / Und Bären Sterben  
wallen (rütteln) / Und / Gott und Himmel klopfen (pochen) / (hart  
und weich)

IIb Öffne dich / Du ragest stumm / Und Tränen / rosten an den Riegeln /  
Mein Sehnen stürmt (pocht) / Du ragst und regest nicht (regst dich  
nicht) / Bei deinen Pfeilern / Grinst trocknet ronnen / erstorben ver-  
trocknet Bluten / Kämpfen Blut Hirn

III Du ragest stumm / Der Schlüssel kreischt vor Rost / Zertreten und  
zerblendet / Und steh in Scham zerkrümmt / Und über mich strömt  
hin / Der Rätsel Zug (und reißt mich hin) / Ich greife tastend /  
Halte nichts in Händen / Und schaue auf / Verschlossen / ragt (Du) /  
Das Tor / Und Gott und Himmel klopfen

In the first section, Stramm is still trying to express his original idea that Woman is the shrine of divine mysteries. Faithfully recording whatever comes to his mind, testing words and their associations (Eingang, Rätsel, Herrlichkeit), he finally achieves four lines of poetry that have the true ring of Stramm's diction: "Vor dem Geheimnis bogest du das Tor / Du schließest auf / Und / Läßt die Rätsel eingehn." Section II ab attempts to describe the futile actions of the male partner. The first part (a), with its interesting play on word sounds (harren-hart) and the formalistic line "Bären, Sterben wallen" which makes use of futuristic elements, reveals the dubious effort to create form before the conceptions have been clarified. Part

IIb, on the other hand, a long and verbose fragment that revels in the morbid imagery of blood and rust, offers descriptive elements without cogent form.

The third section, while starting out with some faint echo of the key-rust-blood imagery of the preceding passage, continues by developing the actions of the two partners. Overcome by the sudden revelation, Man is blinded and confused, until in the end he is thrown back to his former position of the vain pleader. In these few lines at last, Stramm found a fruitful poetic idea. All the preceding parts of the second version were, like the entire first draft, nothing but unsuccessful attempts to describe the theme. Suddenly the three stages, which the final poem will run through, are suggested: an original stage of vain suit, next the revelation of mysteries, and finally a relapse. There are several intermediate versions in which the poet reorganized the subject matter of his poem and tested different aspects of his idea, as possible title notations suggest.<sup>2</sup>

Since Stramm was always concerned with finding the right word, the linguistic process of abstraction must briefly be mentioned. Rephrasing a sentence always implies a change of meaning, as the first line of each version will illustrate. "Du stellst dich vor jedes Geheimnis als Tor" (version 1) is a simple prosaic statement in which only the comparison "als Tor" points toward the transformation of natural speech into poetic diction. In the second version, "Vor dem Geheimnis bogest du das Tor," the metric order is achieved by insufficient means (bogest), yet the verb is already charged with more meaning and the metaphor becomes simple identification.<sup>3</sup> In the final version "Geheimnis bogt das Tor," any reference to a particular situation is avoided, the statement is impersonal, almost a linguistic formula, consisting of three equal parts; the verb, in center position, closely aligns "Geheimnis" and "Tor" by its reference to a vault.

The steps that lead from the second to the final version are just that, a process of condensation and abstraction which transforms all

<sup>2</sup> At one time, Stramm wanted to call the poem "Vergeblich," thus emphasizing Man; "Verblendet" and "Geblendet" were other title suggestions which stress the descriptive elements of version 2, section III. Psychology is implied in "Schüchtern," while "Das Tor" as title merely singles out one image of the poem. Only "Werben" suggests a situation between partners.

<sup>3</sup> This was one of the basic conceptions of "Sturm" poetics. "... Gleichnis darf . . . niemals ein Vergleich sein, sondern das Bild muß an Stelle der Aussage stehen. Man kann, um ein einfaches Beispiel zu nehmen, nicht sagen: ich bin traurig wie der Herbst; es müßte heißen: Ich bin der Herbst." Herwarth Walden in "Der Sturm," vol. vi, 21/22.

personal experience into general laws and cosmic qualities. Whenever the poet seems to speak in an explosive style, it is the final result of a long and complex transformation of natural speech into the chiffre language of poetry, a technique which may remind of Mallarmé.<sup>4</sup> But Stramm, as modern poet who did not write in the traditional patterns of form, had still to solve the problem of structure. While he found suitable subject matter and the proper expressive style by an almost mechanical process of elimination, condensation and depersonalisation, the artistic synthesis of poetic elements remained a task that had to be solved anew with each new poem.<sup>5</sup> The second version had already provided the poet with word patterns that he could use as building elements for the final version, if the necessary stylistic changes were made. In the following lines one can easily recognize the poem "Werben" in its embryonic stage:

Vor dem Geheimnis bogest du das Tor  
Du schließest auf  
Ich harre davor  
zertreten und zerblendet  
Ich greife tastend  
halte nichts in Händen  
Verschlossen ragt das Tor  
und Gott und Himmel klopfen.

In the final version, these lines are arranged with mathematical precision. The three stages of development, vain suit—revelation—relapse, which take four lines each, are interrupted by lines 5 and 10, "Aufschließt dein Blick" and "Dein Lächeln wehrt," that serve as cesuras, denoting the beginning and end of Woman's action. The structure is so well balanced that the poem may be said to correspond to a cubist painting.<sup>6</sup> The difficulties, encountered when first reading

<sup>4</sup> Discussion of "Sainte" and "Sainte Cécile, jouant sur l'aile d'un Chérubin" in Hugo Friedrich, *Die Struktur der modernen Lyrik* (Hamburg 1956), pp. 74-75.

<sup>5</sup> "Das Organische" and "der innere Rhythmus," basic ideas of "Sturm" esthetics (cf. H. Walden, *Einblick in Kunst*, Berlin 1916, pp. 37, 70, 97), show some relationship to the principles of "Jugendstil" (cf. Volker Klötz, "Jugendstil in der Lyrik," *Akzente* IV, 1957, pp. 27-29). Stramm, at least, must have had some knowledge of this movement, since he tried to publish his early poetry in the magazine "Jugend." Hans Blüher, spokesman for the youth movement and author of *Die deutsche Wandervogelbewegung als erotisches Phänomen*, was a close friend of the Stramm family, thus the concept of Eros in Stramm's writings might have been influenced by the "Jugendbewegung."

<sup>6</sup> The painter Franz Marc experienced "reine kubistische Vorstellungen" when reading Stramm's poems (quote from Rudolf N. Maier, *Das moderne Gedicht*, Düsseldorf 1959, p. 37).

the poem, will disappear, if one remembers the former versions. Cosmic law places Man and the mysteries of life in a position of waiting. Woman alone, the great mediator, could grant communication. But there will be no fulfillment; the relapse section imitates the beginning, yet with a note of despair. The inviting line "Geheimnis bogt das Tor" is answered in the negative: "Verschlossen blickt das Tor." The struggle between the two erotic principles will never end, for the poem, while it seems to come to a conclusion, returns to its beginning and thus, by its structure, suggests eternal frustration.

"Werben" is a typical example of Stramm's love poetry. A similar transformation of personal experience into pure cosmic ideas can be found in other poems, as for example in "Liebeskampf," "Erfüllung," "Siede," "Sehnen," "Wunder," or "Triebkrieg." But rarely did Stramm achieve this structural harmony of form becoming expression, as is the case in "Werben," in spite of its obscurities and lack of sentiment a successful example of early *poésie pure* in Germany.

*University of Maryland*

CHRISTOPH HERING

## REVIEWS

**Marjorie Hope Nicolson, *Mountain Gloom and Mountain Glory: The Development of the Aesthetics of the Infinite* (Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Press, 1959. xv + 403 pp.).** MISS Nicolson has attempted to account for the rapturous love of high mountains and wild scenery that seems to distinguish Romantic and post-Romantic from earlier cultures—a love of which the Romantic poets were themselves acutely conscious but of which they had inaccurate, excessively simple, or self-flattering explanations. Miss Nicolson brings to her subject a rich experience in the history of ideas and in the relations of literature to science. She has related the shift in sensibility (1) to the literary tradition that often impeded it; (2) to the double tradition in theology, which, on its primitive Christian-Roman side, was hostile to mountains but which, on its Greek-Hebrew side, was tolerant and

even friendly; and (3) to developments in philosophy and natural science, chiefly geology, that led to a concept of limitless time as well as infinite space. Miss Nicolson brings her book to a climax in discussing, against a fuller background than has ever before been erected for it, the Romantic poets' expression of the "aesthetics of the infinite."

*Mountain Gloom and Mountain Glory* is the definitive exploration of its subject. It completely replaces the view popular a generation or so ago, of which Myra Reynolds's study of nature in eighteenth-century verse was an influential example—a view that confined itself to the literary tradition and that found in every poetic bird warble and every literary sigh over grandeur and gloom a "preromantic" anticipation of nature-worship. Such examples seem sometimes to have been collected with a fascination that increased as one moved backward to the "desertland" of Augustan England. If Akenside's mid-century rhapsodies were titillating, Lady Winchilsea's nocturnes (dreamed by a contemporary of Pope!) were overwhelming.

Miss Nicolson's broader and profounder study also replaces that of C. A. Moore, himself a historian of ideas, who found the chief source of eighteenth-century nature-worship in Deism and liberal theology. The present author has pushed the shift in sensibility deep into the seventeenth century, has more richly explored the relevant writings of Henry More and Thomas Burnet than any previous investigator, and has shown a more acute awareness of multiple causation.

For all that, Miss Nicolson remains strictly a historian of ideas, who rigorously limits herself to written sources and who finds philosophy and theology directly behind literary criticism and poetry. Depth psychology, socio-economic forces, travel, comfort, luxury, the *nouveaux riches*, and the Civil Wars do not much enter her considerations. The question therefore nags—have we achieved, *can* we achieve with these tools, the whole truth about so complex and profound a human response as that accorded rugged mountains? But these largest problems of human psychology have not yet been solved, and at the present state of our knowledge a literary scholar can venture to say only this, that although Miss Nicolson's method may ultimately have to be regarded as too bookish and too intellectually oriented, it is broader, saner, and more useful than any competing methodology that could conceivably be applied to the problem in hand.

Apart from such large and perhaps insoluble problems as these,

two questions remain. The first concerns the relation of the literary sublime to Renaissance and seventeenth-century paintings and to English knowledge and approval of such art. Surely the ruins present in innumerable nativities; the wild, craggy scenery of the St. Jerome paintings; and the desolate atmospheres of some landscapes by Titian, Tintoretto, Salvator Rosa, and Magnasco ought to have been considered. But even here the specialists in the visual arts have not as yet helped us much. Ogden and Ogden (*English Taste in Landscape in the Seventeenth Century*, 1955) note that Peacham admired prospects from mountains in 1612, that the Appenines and the Piedmont Alps were approved features of landscapes in the early century, that wild scenery was conducive to ascetic mysticism, and that ruins were nostalgic and elegiac long before the eighteenth century. But these scholars do not help us much when they associate mountains and horror in connection with Adrian van Diest and suggest, without considering possible relations to antecedent pictorial traditions, that he owed the new atmosphere—if indeed it was new—to reading Dennis's exclamations as a traveler in the Alps. The terrain is unexplored, but one wonders whether the visual arts may not be more germane to Miss Nicolson's topic than some of the philosophers and scientists she so carefully analyzes.

The second question concerns the use of aesthetic terms. *Beauty*, *neoclassical*, *romantic*, *variety*, *irregularity* call for more precise definition. Take, for example, *irregularity*. Is there not more than one kind? Can it be summarily associated with sublimity and pre-romanticism? *Mild* irregularity seems to me an unmistakably neoclassical value. Pope, in his essay on *Pastoral Poetry* (1709), is hardly on the side of rapturous grandeur when he calls for a variety in describing prospects that, he says, is achieved by "agreeable" objects in the country, by "beautiful" digressions, by "elegant" verbal turns, and by "little" circumstances. *Wild* irregularity is of course something else, but even it cannot be associated exclusively with the seventeenth-century intellectual developments Miss Nicolson has explored. Ovid's "sympathetic" landscapes, Shakespeare's dramatic use of wild nature in the tragedies, Ariosto's desolate Alpine scenes, Vasari's and E. K.'s delight in "naturall rudeness" and "disorderly order" all antedate the bulk of Miss Nicolson's evidence. Even Pope, whom Miss Nicolson classifies as insensitive to the new developments, makes large concessions to "nameless graces," "lucky

license," and "brave disorder" in the very *locus classicus* of neo-classical criticism and illustrates these qualities by a mountain scene:

In prospects thus, some objects please our eyes  
Which out of nature's common order rise,  
The shapeless rock, or hanging precipice.

*Northwestern University*

JEAN H. HAGSTRUM

**Vernon J. Harward, Jr., *The Dwarfs of Arthurian Romance and Celtic Tradition* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1958. 149 pp.).** THE dwarf is so ubiquitous in Arthurian fiction that he is usually taken for granted as a commonplace of romance, appropriate enough as part of the "fairy tale" setting but hardly worthy of serious study. Dr. Harward's dissertation, prepared under the direction of Professor R. S. Loomis of Columbia University, should help to revise this impression. His monograph is a careful analysis of the various dwarfs in the romances to determine their distinctive characteristics and functions and their relationships to the dwarfs of Celtic tradition. Naturally, there are dwarfs in other literary traditions, notably the Germanic, but Mr. Harward wisely limits his study to those with a clearly defined influence upon Arthurian romance.

In one of his most interesting chapters (pp. 20-27), he examines the commonly held belief that the dwarfs of romance were modeled upon court dwarfs in real life. Surprisingly few references to actual dwarfs support this assumption. The documentary evidence suggests that court dwarfs were so rare as to evoke comment in the earlier Middle Ages, and the other references appear in accounts obviously imitated from literary sources or in records written long after the establishment of the Arthurian vogue.<sup>1</sup> Some slight influence from court dwarfs who functioned as entertainers or jesters may be detected in the treatment of the spying dwarf in the *Tristan* legend (pp. 107-110), but even this figure owes more to literary tradition than Mr. Harward realizes.<sup>2</sup> Although court dwarfs undoubtedly existed despite the scanty records about them, Mr. Harward seems correct in his conclusion that the origin of the Arthurian dwarf in the romances is not to be sought in real life.

<sup>1</sup> For the influence of Arthurian romance on sport and spectacle see *Arthurian Literature in the Middle Ages*, ed. R. S. Loomis (Oxford, 1959), pp. 553-559.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. H. Newstead, *Romance Philology*, IX (1956), 275-284, and *ibid.*, XI (1958), 246-253.

Mr. Harward's survey of Irish, Welsh, Breton, and Cornish lore about dwarfs shows that Celtic tradition abounds in dwarf kings of marvelous beauty, supernatural powers, and impeccable ethics, who rule subterranean realms of fabulous wealth. Other powerful dwarfs, however, are hideous in appearance and hostile to mortals. Most of the book is devoted to tracing these traditions and their transformations in Arthurian romance. Some of the arguments, of course, are stronger than others, but Mr. Harward evaluates the evidence judiciously. Where it is tenuous, he refrains from stretching it. He finds in Welsh traditions about Beli the origin of Bilis, the dwarf king of the Antipodes, mentioned in Chrétien's *Erec* as one of Arthur's noble vassals. The same Welsh figure has influenced Pelles, the hermit uncle of Perceval in *Perlesvaus*, and Pelles, the king of the Grail castle in the *Vulgate Lancelot* and *Queste*. The names, in addition to such distinctive traits as the relationship of the dwarf to a giant kinsman, establish the connection with the Welsh prototype. Other Arthurian dwarfs reveal different aspects of the Welsh tradition: these exceptionally handsome dwarfs are custodians of supernatural vessels that test virtue, heal the sick, and perform a variety of marvels (pp. 62-81). Though diminutive in size, they are amazingly powerful in combat but benevolent towards defeated foes. The dwarfs in this group are usually related to damsels with miraculous gifts of healing rather than to giant kinsmen.

The lack of a corresponding nomenclature obscures the connections of many Arthurian dwarfs with the Welsh Beli, a fact that Mr. Harward frankly takes into account. In the later romances, too, as a consequence of rationalization and the fading of supernatural traits, identification with Celtic prototypes becomes difficult though not improbable. If the reader remains skeptical of some identifications, his perceptions will nevertheless be sharpened as he follows Mr. Harward. For example, the discussion of *The Turk and Gowin*, a rare instance of Irish material transmitted directly to Britain, clearly discriminates between these traditions and those derived from the Welsh and modified by the French. Mr. Harward also distinguishes between Celtic and non-Celtic elements. Not all the stories of Arthurian dwarfs are Celtic in origin: some are oriental (pp. 132-135), some Germanic (pp. 72 f.), and some remain unidentified (pp. 36 f.). Despite contributions from other sources, however, the dwarfs in Arthurian romance owe their most significant traits to Celtic literary tradition. Mr. Harward's monograph documents in sub-

stantial detail the conjecture made long ago by Sir John Rhys that the "uncanny dwarf of Celtic story" served as a model for the dwarfs of Arthurian romance.

*Hunter College*

HELAINE NEWSTEAD

**Edwin Haviland Miller, *The Professional Writer in Elizabethan England. A Study of Nondramatic Literature* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1959. xvi + 282 pp. \$5.00).** PROFESSOR Miller's survey of the literary profession in the age of Elizabeth is concerned only with writing for publication and not with writing for the stage. Its most important chapters deal with the writer's relations with patrons and publishers. On these matters it presents information carefully assembled from a wide range of miscellaneous sources, among the most fruitful of which are prefaces and dedicatory addresses; authors' statements about themselves, as in the autobiographical indulgences of Greene and Churchyard; and their comments on one another, as in the Parnassus plays or the pamphlet hostilities of Harvey and Nashe.

A difficulty of this kind of material is that authors' statements are rarely unbiased. When they attack one another, allowance has to be made for literary satire or personal malice; when they speak of themselves, for a disingenuousness which disguises real motives. Many assertions that a book has fallen into the printer's hands against its author's intention, as Mr. Miller shows from an analysis of their implicit contradictions, are obviously subterfuges. To take a single example, *The Second Part of the Mirror for Magistrates* simultaneously says that Blenerhasset will be surprised to find the book in print and that he has taken pains to be intelligible to the simplest reader. A further difficulty is the extreme paucity of financial records. Statements such as that in the Court records of the Stationers' Company about what Stow received for the second edition of his *Survey of London* are necessarily few. And though authors are sometimes outspoken about the unappreciativeness of the public or the stinginess of the recipients of their dedications, with the valuable exception of Richard Robinson in his manuscript *Eupolemia* they rarely specify sums received. Contemporary references to forty shillings as a normal sum in reward for a dedication or payment for a pamphlet seem to

have been clichés—like the ‘two-hours’ traffic of the stage perhaps—which do not accurately reflect facts. Calculations based on sale prices and the size of editions may afford a useful check, but these too are rarely known with certainty. Yet by a weighing of the evidence which is usually judicious, Mr. Miller is able to give us a notion of how and how far a non-dramatic author could manage to make a living. Among other facts clearly established are that the normal purpose of a dedication was financial and that authors often eked out, or even supplied the place of, money payments by touting copies of the printed book. Many examples are also given of the well-known shifts to which the impecunious resorted—their assiduity with funeral elegies and New Year presentation verses; their dedication of different parts or even different copies of a work to different patrons; their patching up of old books in new disguises or making fresh ones out of other people’s.

The economics of the literary profession is Mr. Miller’s real subject; and he might have done better to expand further on this at the expense of the social background of the writers and their attitude to their audience, on which he is less rewarding. His book has something of the air of having been compiled from a card-index with its sections predetermined. Unnecessary space is given to matters like censorship, the moral bias of literary criticism, literacy and schooling, which turn out to be peripheral. The relevance of particular details is not always apparent. What has the rise of Thomas Bodley and Thomas Smith of the East India Company (p. 43) to do with the nature of the reading public? Some conclusions, like that at the end of chapter 2, are too vague to be of use: “the Elizabethan audience was, then, a heterogeneous group” which “resembled closely the audiences of succeeding centuries.” Others, aiming at something more definite, may overreach the evidence. The generalization that writers were conscious of betraying their upbringing seems to rest on the cases of Munday and Greene (pp. 17-18). That the vogue for prodigal son stories concealed a general sense of guilt is one of several precarious inferences. Is it just to suggest from Lyly’s address to the Ladies while ignoring that to the Gentlemen readers that *Euphues and his England* made its special appeal to women? (p. 62). Some curious incidental judgments may be due to an anxiety to make a point where none is obvious. Why does it discredit Meres’s morality for him to say that Peele died of the pox? (p. 16). Why must the eroticism of *Venus and Adonis* and *Lucrece* be “decadent”?

(p. 49). Because Mr. Hotson, bolstering up his early date for the Sonnets, has attributed the character of Shakespeare's narrative poems to the supposed taste of Southampton, is Southampton to be dismissed as a fop? (pp. 45, 97). What is there in Ascham's attack on Italian books that "borders on hysteria"? (p. 176). In such comments overwriting easily descends to cliché. The reiteration of the word "hacks" is hardly redeemed by a belated attempt to define it; and the hacks' flatteries or complaints are likely to become "mouthing" or "whinings." A "search for subversive literature" is inevitably "frenzied" (p. 185); and when Elizabeth enforces the laws against it, the scaffolds have to be "gory with the blood of booksellers and authors." Literary criticism especially is vitiated when language of this kind is employed: "Marlovian supermen with their infantile aggressiveness and lust sputtered and gesticulated . . . and then, like their creator, vanished in an iridescent (*sic*) cloud of words."

The misprint is not a unique one and there are occasional slips. A well-known treatise of James I is twice called *Basilicon Doran*. *Literae petaces* becomes a catchphrase in the singular. We are told that Sir Thomas More estimated that forty per cent of the people could read; what he does say is that far more than forty per cent could not. An incomplete quotation from Meres on page 100 does not make sense; it obscures Meres's point that needy poets, lacking patrons, get their best support from actors.

Documentation is full and accurate; but it is in some respects very inconvenient. The practice of combining references into one collective note per paragraph often makes it difficult to attach a statement to its correct authority, and the absence of a list of sources necessitates much tedious search among the notes to ascertain editions quoted from.

Westfield College, London

HAROLD JENKINS

Charles Ryskamp, *William Cowper of the Inner Temple, Esq. A Study of His Life and Works to the Year 1768* (New York: Cambridge Univ. Press 1959. xviii + 275 pp. \$5.50). WHATEVER may be the decline of William Cowper's twentieth century reputation as a poet, interest in his biography has persisted. For several reasons, however, biographical treatments have tended to be inbred and

parasitical interpretations rather than fresh and objective examinations of primary sources. The major—and, indeed, the all but insurmountable—obstacle has been the increasingly frustrating fact that no accurate and reliably complete edition of the letters exists.

So many interpretations of the poet, so many considerations of his religious experiences and his psychopathic tendencies have been superimposed on a relatively static body of factual material that, as Professor Charles Ryskamp has aptly put it, "the origins of the chains of information and myth have become so obscure and complex that it has become difficult to separate later interpretations from the evidence of Cowper himself, or from that of his contemporaries."

Ryskamp's new biographical study justly rejects the overworked interpretative tradition for a "facts and problems" approach designed to seek out new primary sources of information and to re-examine directly the older sources. The scope of the work is the first thirty-six years of the poet's life: that is, from his birth at Berkhamstead through his distressing departure from the Temple, his "cure" at Dr. Cotton's, and his residence at Huntington—the period for which study is least impeded by the situation regarding the letters. Since Cowper has been chiefly known as he appeared in his later years (often as a pious and psychotic recluse in a provincial village), the new study seeks to bring the total picture of his life into better perspective by showing him as a reasonably normal and worldly young man: a student in one of England's most distinguished public schools who participated in the usual childhood sports and made warm friends among his fellow Westminsters, an indifferent reader of law, a socially inclined young resident of the Temple, and a smartly dressed member of as bright and witty a club as London in the mid-eighteenth century could boast.

By no means, of course, had this side of the picture been unknown. Nevertheless, Ryskamp has been able to document it beyond question and to enrich it at several points. The detailed information about the poet's school days at Westminster (his living quarters, his school activities, his sports, his friends), as well as the same kind of information about his residence in the Middle and Inner Temple, is a desirable addition to our factual knowledge of the poet.

The biographer maintains the same sort of objectivity in regard to less tangible matters, the "problems" of the young Cowper. The question of insanity in the family—suppressed by early biographers for obvious reasons and only sparsely documented by later ones—is

again examined, with new information concerning Theadora [sic in the spelling of her own day]—with whom Ryskamp is willing to believe that Cowper was genuinely in love. Both consanguinity (the reason first advanced by James Croft) and the knowledge of hereditary "melancholy" are the reasons assigned to Ashley Cowper's causing the engagement of the two cousins to be broken off.

In regard to the related matter of Cowper's alleged physical defect, Ryskamp carefully examines the probable provenance of the statement concerning it in the *Greville Memoirs*, as well as the possible logical consequences of such a deformity, concluding that "Cowper's reputed hermaphroditism was a pre-occupation resulting from melancholia." In countering the suggestions both of actual hermaphroditism and latent homosexuality, the biographer adduces a considerable body of evidence for Cowper's youthful heterosexuality. The complicated circumstances of Cowper's failure to accept the proffered clerkship in the House of Lords are extensively examined in the light of the political involvements of the Cowper family.

Three appendices provide documentary materials that, though often minor, are valuable both intrinsically and for the evidence of careful search that they demonstrate. A number of early uncollected letters are printed, including the earliest extant letter, now in the Pierpont Morgan Library, and complete letters, or significant parts of them, from the Houghton Library at Harvard, the Henry E. Huntington Library, the Panshanger Collection in the Hertford County Record Office, the private collection of Reverend Wilfred Cowper Johnson at Norwich, and miscellaneous sales catalogues. Some essays, especially "letters" to periodicals, are also reprinted.

If Ryskamp does not succeed in establishing the authorship of a letter signed "W. C." in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, he makes an interesting argument—as he does also in attempting to identify "Toby" of the early letters with a colorful rake named Chase Price. The annotation for "A Dissertation on a Modern Ode" is complete and careful rather than revealing.

Again, in an appendix including uncollected poetry "early and late," Ryskamp argues more cogently for Cowper's authorship of an epitaph on General Wolfe than he does for including in the canon "A Reflection on the Year 1720," a short poem appearing in January, 1750, in *The Student, or the Oxford Monthly Miscellany*, with which Cowper's friend, Bonnell Thornton, was concerned. Ryskamp also prints five poems written between 1773 and 1781 existing in auto-

graph in the Huntington Library. In addition, he provides a useful note on the translation of the *Henriade* and identifies a collection of hymns in which Cowper assisted the Reverend Rowland Hill.

A final appendix considers for good measure (since, like some of the uncollected poems, they are outside the chronological limits of the biography) the uncollected contributions to magazines: *i. e.*, the reviews that the poet wrote for the *Analytical Review*, and two delightful letters to the *Gentleman's Magazine* burlesquing the solemn controversies about trivial matters that often appeared in its pages.

If the appendices seem to range somewhat widely, the strictly biographical section does not. The book as a whole, in fact, represents an admirably disciplined performance; and it is a genuine, if limited, contribution to the field.

*North Carolina State College*

LODWICK HARTLEY

**E. D. Hirsch, Jr., *Wordsworth and Schelling. A Typological Study of Romanticism* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1960. xiii + 214 pp. \$4.00. *Yale Studies in English*, 145).** NEARLY sixty years ago, A. C. Bradley wrote of Wordsworth, "His poetry is immensely interesting as an imaginative expression of the same mind which, in his day, produced in Germany great philosophies. His poetic experience, his intuitions, his single thoughts, even his large views, correspond in a striking way, sometimes in a startling way, with ideas methodically developed by Kant, Schelling, Hegel, Schopenhauer."

Mr. Hirsch has undertaken to document this insight by detailed reference to the earlier writings of Schelling, published between the years 1797 and 1806. These are compared with Wordsworth's thought as expressed between the years 1797 and 1805. Mr. Hirsch goes further and argues that the two authors held at this period an identical *Weltanschauung*. Here he follows Dilthey in arguing that philosophy, theology and art are based ultimately on "actual, vital experience." Wordsworth and Schelling are said to have enjoyed experience of the same structure and significance, and this despite certain real differences of personality.

Mr. Hirsch proceeds on the very reasonable assumption that Wordsworth was not, during this period, aware of Schelling's thought, nor Schelling of Wordsworth's poetry. Thus this is not a study in literary influence, but the examination of a type of experience. Here, I think

we should recall that Wordsworth, however much he may resemble Schelling, actually *shared* much of his experience and his meditations upon this experience with his friend Coleridge. Nonetheless, no reference is made,—and I think that this is unfortunate,—to the many conversations between Wordsworth and Coleridge through which the thinking of the two poets developed; nor are Coleridge's poems mentioned in any detail. Any study of Wordsworth and Schelling should include constant reference to Coleridge and this is true even though Coleridge himself was not, during the years here considered, acquainted with Schelling's writings. Any community of attitude and orientation that can be found in Wordsworth and Schelling may also be studied in Coleridge. The conversation poems and even the *Ancient Mariner* are most relevant. We must remember that Coleridge later recognized how close his earlier thinking had been to that of Schelling and that in *Biographia Literaria* he actually accepted much of Schelling's philosophy. If Mr. Hirsch is studying a *Weltanschauung* for its own sake, he should entitle his study *Wordsworth, Coleridge, and Schelling* and examine all three with equal attention.

Again, I feel that Mr. Hirsch should pay more attention to other philosophers. There is something almost arbitrary about his conviction that Wordsworth's attitude and orientation correspond more closely to Schelling's than to, let us say, that of Boehme or Plotinus. At any rate, one can hardly be sure without exploring in considerable detail the case that can be made for these other thinkers. And this Mr. Hirsch does not undertake. Certainly there is no method of "holistic" interpretation that will exclude consideration of such thinkers as Boehme and Plotinus, even granted that at first glance Schelling may seem a more likely choice. Nor is it by any means self-evident that Wordsworth's basic experience may be best illuminated by comparison with that of a *single* philosopher. After all, there is something rather brittle and doctrinaire about Mr. Hirsch's reference to theories concerning "intrinsic types" of *Weltanschauungen* and to those concerning "cultural selfhood." Interesting as these notions are,—and they deserve more discussion than Mr. Hirsch has given them,—they should never be allowed to legislate *a priori* and either to necessitate or exclude possibilities of interpretation and comparison. There is, I think, a very real danger that Mr. Hirsch's insistence upon the "intrinsic typification" of a *weltanschauung* will narrow his interpretation. He is hoping for a gain in "unity and depth." But his method may result in an over-simplification that

blinds us to the wealth of experience and reflection that the student of Wordsworth and Coleridge must consider. For instance, exclusive emphasis on Schelling will tempt us to ignore, as Mr. Hirsch does ignore, the very considerable relevance of Hartley and Alison with their emphasis on the data of the senses and the association of ideas.

But we must not make too much of these difficulties. No one can deny that Mr. Hirsch has written of Wordsworth and Schelling with insight and sympathy. He has emphasized just those features of Wordsworth's work that appeal most to the transcendentalist, or, as he would prefer to say, the "enthusiast," and he can help us to read and appreciate Wordsworth from this point of view. There can be no doubt that such a reading of Wordsworth prepares us sympathetically to follow the argument of Schelling's idealism. Both writers help us overcome the limitations that have resulted from the bifurcation of nature implicit in the theories of Descartes and Locke, whose sharp distinction between subject and object has led again and again to an academic or theoretical skepticism concerning the objective reference of our consciousness and to a practical skepticism concerning ultimate values in life and conduct.

Wordsworth himself was once all too clearly and painfully aware of this latter difficulty, which he overcame in a manner that reminds us of Schelling's philosophy. For both poet and philosopher, the imaginative attitude of the artist is taken to supplement that of the observer and theorist concerned primarily with calculation and classification. As Schelling would put it, "art is an organ of philosophy," and the philosopher owes more to the artist than he does to the scientist. In creative imagination subject and object are reconciled in a way that Descartes and Locke never envisaged.

I remember well

That in life's every-day appearances  
I seem'd about this period to have sight  
Of a new world, a world, too, that was fit  
To be transmitted and made visible  
To other eyes, as having for its base  
That whence our dignity originates,  
That which both gives it being and maintains  
A balance, an ennobling interchange  
Of action from within and from without,  
The excellence, pure spirit, and best power  
Both of the object seen, and eye that sees.

After all, the creative consciousness of the artist may be said to

"belong" to the world of things that he celebrates just as surely as it does to his own personal history. Imagination is a "creative sensibility" and is supported by a "wise passiveness." The poet enjoys nature and nature comes to light in his poetry. Subject and object are poles of a single process: they are both manifestations of that "one life within us and abroad." As Mr. Hirsch summarises, "Imagination brings thought and being together in an active reciprocal unity." He quotes in support the famous lines

my voice proclaims  
How exquisitely the individual Mind  
(And the progressive powers perhaps no less  
Of the whole species) to the external World  
Is fitted: — and how exquisitely, too —  
Theme this but little heard of among men —  
The external World is fitted to the Mind;  
And the creation (by no lower name  
Can it be called) which they with blended might  
Accomplish: — this is our high argument.

This doctrine is at once good Wordsworth and good Schelling. (It is also good Boehme, but that is another story.)

Our failure to maintain ourselves at the level of imaginative consciousness is interpreted in much the same way by both poet and philosopher.

Consciousness, employed wrongly, "Mis-shapes the beauteous forms of things." Only consciousness has the unhappy capacity to pore on things minute "In disconnection dead and spiritless." That is a perversion of mind. It is

the very littleness of life.  
Such consciousness I deem but accidents,  
Relapses from the one interior life  
That lives in all things, sacred from the touch  
Of that false secondary power by which  
In weakness we create distinctions.

Schelling makes explicit the point implied by Wordsworth's use of the word "relapse."

It is not because of their science but because of their *guilt* that such finitude should exist for certain philosophers. Their own will has strayed from the unity. It wants to have a being for itself, and it therefore fails to see either itself or things as they really are, namely, in God. And since, furthermore, the religious view is precisely the seeing of all things in God, without any need for proof or further grounding, but simply with a complete innocence of the contrary possibility, such a finite world can only come about by the straying of the individual will

from God who is the unity and blessedness of all things. It can only come from a truly Platonic fall, in which state man believes that the dead, absolutely manifold world which he conceives in separation is actually the true and real world. . . . The fact of the existence of such a world in human consciousness is precisely as widespread as the fact of sin. Indeed this is the very fact of sin itself.

The root of all evil is consciousness operating in separation, consciousness denying its connections. This produces not only false knowledge but, as Schelling implied, false action.

(pp. 112-113)

Again, Mr. Hirsch quotes happily from Schelling

"All healing lies only in nature. She alone is the true antidote to abstraction." "Nature is the only dam against the arbitrariness of thought and the freedom of abstraction." Nature redeems the mind from its isolation. We can only begin to *see* nature when our minds begin to relinquish their exclusive mastery. "To the degree that we silence ourselves in ourselves, so speaks she to us."

But there is also danger from the other side. As Wordsworth phrased it, there may be "a subjugation of an opposite character." The mind can be controlled exclusively by its object. Characteristically, for this event, Wordsworth employs the metaphor of slavery:

By objects of the senses not enslaved.

The tendency, too potent in itself,  
Of habit to enslave the mind, I mean  
Oppress it by the laws of vulgar sense.

The tyranny of objects can produce the same kind of isolation and lifelessness that blind vacuity produces. The two are, in fact, corollaries. To hang upon an object in brute slavery is to see it as isolated from the living whole which only Imagination can know. And, to think about objects abstractly is to think of them as isolated. Both one-sided sense perception and one-sided mental activity have separated, finite objects. [As Schelling has said,] "It is the fault of the individual that a mere finite thing should exist for him." That was Peter Bell's fault. Neglectful of the universal life, he was a mere thinker and a mere perceiver.

A primrose by a river's brim  
A yellow primrose was to him,  
And it was nothing more. (pp. 132-133)

The above passages seem to me to be the most interesting and the most illuminating in Mr. Hirsch's study. They make very clear the genuine relevance of Wordsworth's thinking to the dialectical spirit of German idealism that demands a wedding of thought and sensibility and through these of spirit and nature.

Mr. Hirsch has much to say about the "logic of imagination" that unites opposites in reciprocity and he presses this notion toward a bold conclusion. He is not content to limit this reciprocity to a harmony of active and passive movements within one consciousness. Rather, he applies the notion of "both-and" to the very structure of the images produced. There are then certain privileged images that reflect the "dialectic" of imagination (p. 103).

The swan on still St. Mary's lake  
Float double, swan and shadow!

or better

Our noisy years seem moments in the being  
Of the eternal silence.

There follows an interesting meditation upon the image of the sea considered as a unity of opposites.

... the real focus of Wordsworth's poem is not on the beyond itself but on the active processes of life which the beyond illuminates. That is the reason, I think, that Wordsworth culminates his vision and the central stanzas of the Ode with an image which symbolizes both life's static perfection and its active processes—the image of the sea.

In *The Prelude* the sea is expressive of the poet's growing "sentiment of Being." In all things he felt one life, "in the wave itself, And mighty depth of waters." The sea suggests both noisy years (we hear the waters) and eternal silence as a single, dynamic whole. Even the "land" on which we as adults now stand is part of the "immortal sea" which the actual sea symbolizes. It is life's source (the children have, presumably, been cast up on the shore) and its involucrum (like the eternal silence). Life's active diversity is represented by the waves ("Thou art to me but as a wave Of the wild sea"), which are a ceaseless, active striving on the surface of a divine reality eternally fulfilled and eternally the same; below the waves there is the silence of the "mighty depth of waters." Waves and depths make up a majestic indivisible whole whose immortal activity and calm is suggested by the "mighty waters rolling evermore."

(p. 172)

This interpretation is fascinating and heightens our enjoyment of passages in *The Prelude*, the Immortality Ode and other poems. But it need not direct our attention exclusively toward Schelling or, for that matter, toward German idealism in general. The relation of time to eternity has been considered in this light by many thinkers. We may be reminded of the 90th Psalm and the hymnal's "Before the hills in order stood . . . Oh everlasting, Thou art God!" And of Augustine's "Non in tempore sed cum tempore finxit deus mundum." The paradoxical relationship of time and eternity has fascinated both

poets and philosophers over the centuries, and as Evelyn Underhill has pointed out the mystics are often concerned to reconcile the fulness or perfection of being with its creative power.

Despite the difficulties mentioned, I have enjoyed studying Mr. Hirsch's book. There is certainly something that we can learn by considering Wordsworth and Schelling together. But we must be careful not to pay too much for this insight by overlooking equally illuminating comparisons.

*Indiana University*

NEWTON P. STALLKNECHT

**David Levin, *History as Romantic Art. Bancroft, Prescott, Motley, and Parkman* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford Univ. Press, 1959. x + 260 pp. \$5.50. *Stanford Studies in Language and Literature*, 20).** THE literature of the history of American history consists of the survey by Michael Kraus which is now twenty-three years old, a discussion from the English side by H. H. Bellot, an assortment of recent studies of such major historians as George Bancroft, Francis Parkman, F. J. Turner, Carl Becker, Charles A. Beard, and Charles M. Andrews, a uniquely large and excellent lot of books and articles about Henry Adams, and a miscellany of scholarship, mainly essays, some of which are quite old, that examines bits and pieces of the subject from Captain John Smith to Allan Nevins. Broad treatments and interpretations of American historiography are lacking; and historians today seldom turn to American historical writings earlier than 1880, either to learn the substance of events or to investigate the minds of the writers. Almost never does one historian write about another historian, whether living or dead, in his role as a man of letters.

These circumstances throw into high relief the present study of Bancroft, Prescott, Motley, and Parkman. The author is a student of American letters and thought trained at Harvard by Perry Miller: in the way of speaking that prevails in American universities—Dr. Levin teaches at Stanford—he is not an historian at all, he is a professor of literature. Choosing the master-historians of the half-century preceding 1890, with a suggestion of disdain he cuts back of the three Adamses who during the 1870's and 1880's made themselves the principal innovators of academic or "scientific" history—Charles Kendall at Michigan and Cornell, Henry during his brief tenure at Harvard,

and Herbert Baxter at Johns Hopkins. Only two of Levin's heroes, George Bancroft and Francis Parkman, wrote "American history" in the now customary use of that phrase. But the other two, in their majestic narratives, Prescott's histories of Spanish power and conquest on both sides of the Atlantic and Motley's *Rise of the Dutch Republic*, are shown to have been quite as nationalistically American in their tastes and values as any major historians have ever been.

Levin examines the presuppositions and the devices used by the four, and he finds them remarkably akin and alike. They are to be understood, he insists, as having been of the heart and center of the American Renaissance—this seems to adopt F. O. Matthiessen's meaning of that phrase. Rooted in the "literary Unitarianism" of the American region which from its Puritan beginnings had always loved history, preoccupied as the painters and novelists of their age were by the entrancement of portraying peoples and places distant in time and space, and imbued as contemporary lawyers and philosophers were with a conviction that "the moral world is swayed by general laws," the four historians were endowed with a persuasive background for thinking of human affairs in heroic and spectacular terms. "Mind rules the world," said George Bancroft, but he did not mean that the intellect governs; he meant that the natural man's quick perception of right and wrong decides things—for the overall progress of mankind.

Two-fifths of the book is given to examining the conventionalization of the characters with which the romantic histories are peopled and to the ideas and attitudes—including a factor of racism—which the authors in many ways voiced. And a second two-fifths, the last main subdivision of the book, is given to discussing the historian's art as specifically displayed in three works, *The Conquest of Mexico*, the *Rise of the Dutch Republic*, and *Montcalm and Wolfe*. Historians who may happen to be, like the reviewer, tired of the rigidities and near-determinisms which history-as-social-science and history-as-logical-analysis often impose on the historiography of our times, will find Levin's exposition a little depressing in one respect. How these four believers in freedom envisaged the objects of their study to have been controlled and predestined, and also—for us more important—how they themselves were limited by their very views and presuppositions, is far clearer now than it was before *History as Romantic Art* was written. Yet on his final page Levin observes that while their literary "reliance on contrasting types restricted the historians to limited kinds of subjects, it gave their best histories an order and a

significance that recent, 'scientific' monographs too often lack." He has written an important, and at points an inspiring, book.

*The Johns Hopkins University*

CHARLES A. BARKER

**Klaus Lanzinger, *Primitivismus und Naturalismus im Prosaschaffen Herman Melvilles* (Innsbruck: Universitätsverlag Wagner, 1959. viii + 140 pp.).** THOSE of us who attempt to illuminate the darker recesses of American literature through the critical act of imposing formulae must learn to question fully, and perhaps destructively, the value of our methods. Perhaps none is exempt from the obligation. There is a special problem, one of continuous resistance, for the critic of American literary art, from early Romanticism to the present: he confronts an idiom of ambiguity, an obdurate quality of the paradoxical and the protean. His author's angle of vision is frequently inconstant; the apex moves. The conditions which create this problem are deeply urgent in American culture. They have yet to be clearly measured. But it would appear certain that in a relatively *history-less* nation an artistic concern with human time and the human condition has had either to reflect an ontological quest shaped by the Puritan inheritance or to advance art as its own ontological end, or to perform both acts, disparate as they are, in an eventuating paradox. The real service to us of Charles Feidelson's *Symbolism and American Literature* becomes increasingly apparent. The rise and the persistence of the symbolic mode in American literature is to be understood through the nature of the symbol as the encompassment of approaches to reality in themselves irreconcilable.

The inconstancy of vision here referred to may be studied in major authors from Cooper to Faulkner. It is particularly demanding of recognition from the rise of Transcendentalism onward. A case in point may be simply proposed here: Emily Dickinson's brilliant inconstancy in her recurrent contemplation of death, human time, and eternity. The search for the "pure strain" in critical objectives is fruitless. Each poem is a thing unto itself, a symbol of one unfixed point determined by impermanent intersections of lines of vision. When it comes to Melville, the difficulty of imposing formulae is even greater. The problem of the individual induces the paradoxes of a whole civilization of the Christian West. If one demands consistency, one may follow a direct critical line, recording all that will support

his thesis, and minimizing the peril of encounter with those contradictions within Melville himself, endlessly antagonistic and yet simultaneously expressed in symbols of multiple vision.

Mr. Lanzinger, who is a member of the Amerika-Institut at the University of Innsbruck, has chosen to study Melville anew with attention to primitivism and naturalism as the dominant streams of his artistry. It is his prerogative, certainly, to disclaim a major concern with Melville's symbols and to turn his discussion upon Melville as critic of society and civilization (p. 4). "In dieser Arbeit wird versucht, den Naturalismus bei Melville aus dem Problemkreis des Primitivismus heraus zu erklären. Ich halte die gleichzeitige Betrachtung des Primitivismus und Naturalismus bei Melville für wichtig, weil dadurch die oft komplizierte und undurchsichtige Problematik Melvilles einen festen Angelpunkt erhält, von dem aus sich eine Reihe einzeln dastehender Fragen klären lassen. / Eine systematische Behandlung der gegenseitigen Ergänzung von Primitivismus und Naturalismus bei Melville ist meines Wissens noch nicht gemacht worden" (p. 4). The firm pole (of vision) here attributed to Melville appears to be a consistency more of the critic than of the author. The thesis of Mr. Lanzinger's study is an ingenious one; and were it not for its firm inviolability before the pressure of Melville's own inconsistencies and his characteristic multiplicity, it might serve us uniquely. It is set forth in a lucid and well-tempered prose, admirably compressed at many points, with a very wide documentation which comprehends, or at least recognizes, all the important criticism of Melville which has thus far appeared.

Briefly reviewed, the study proceeds in this manner. Melville began his career with *Typee* as a hymn of praise (p. 15) of the natural state of man (Rousseauistic praise since Mr. Lanzinger believes that Melville here follows a pure incidence of the noble savage in early American romanticism). This hymn of *Typee* proceeds as a contradiction of the bitterness of the youth's earlier experience with family catastrophes (pp. 24-35). The attacks upon missionaries and imperialists in both *Typee* and *Omoo* are conceived in Melville's disillusionment with the chicaneries of a civilized world of Christian profession. Beginning with *Mardi* Melville establishes his characteristic use of the sea as a symbol of life and proceeds to unmask the primitive, stripping away his own false view of the paradisiacal natural state and uncovering its predatoriness, its demoniacal character, and its frightfulness. The white shark of *Mardi* passes into the white shark

of *White-Jacket* and then into the white whale of *Moby-Dick*. Civilized man is a creature haunted by the demoniacal and mythical primitive past (*Angst und Dämonie*, p. 59).

Concomitant with this metamorphosis of feeling toward the primitive is Melville's rising awareness of social injustice and misery, first seen in the descriptions of Liverpool and of life aboard the *St. Lawrence* in *Redburn*. Thus Melville's disillusionment, as it mounts through the pages of *White-Jacket*, *Moby-Dick*, and *Pierre*, produces, in the literary sense, the first important American manifestation of naturalism. The universe is moved by a blind and unfeeling cosmic force, and man is its victim; determinism is the only means of philosophical inquiry. Man is the inheritor of the *Urwelt* (as Melville understood the primitive through the geology of his day); the *Urwelt* is itself chaos (p. 64). Hence primitivism and naturalism become intertwined in Melville's maturity. The hopelessness of pursuing truth (as in *Pierre*) is precisely what it is because the chaos of the primitive perseveres in the human condition. The *Kernpunkt* (p. 82) of *Pierre*, as Mr. Lanzinger sees it, exhibits a dead center of nihilism (p. 85): we inherit nothing save chaos, and we can appeal to nothing save the blind force that animates us. Yet Melville continues writing as a naturalist, and, after "discovering" anew (and briefly) a Christian faith at the close of *Clarel* (p. 108), takes his leave with *Billy Budd*. The *Fragenkomplex* of a duration of fifty years is reasserted. Where is the possibility of reconciling innocence and corruption? Mr. Lanzinger seems to regard Billy as Adamic innocence sacrificed by a materialistic civilization, an ideal inappropriate to the world and wholly unrealizable (pp. 112-113).

Following the discussion of *Pierre* there occurs a rather sudden compression of the analysis. Granted that Melville's early primitivism becomes *primevalism*, as Mr. Lanzinger contends (p. 57), and that this awareness of the wild and the demoniacal in man and of the blind indifference of universal force becomes the matrix of naturalism, what justification is there in declining the critical responsibility of examining the stories which occupied Melville during the middle '50's (p. 98); or of dismissing *Clarel* with four pages of commentary, none of which notices the paradoxical and inwardly contentious imagery of head and heart which is clearly vital in this most intricate poem? One can be grateful for many excellent judgments in Mr. Lanzinger's study. He understands and urges, for instance, the vast importance of *Mardi* as one of the landmarks of American

fiction. He traces with skill and ease many important prefigurations in the progression of Melville's art. He insists, to the good of all critical vision in American letters, that Melville is, in many respects, the precursor of Frank Norris, Theodore Dreiser, Jack London, and Ernest Hemingway. (See pp. 113-117.) But one encounters here, as well, a kind of facileness which appears too often to give us "the story of Melville," or the story of American literature, as in the manner of a Van Wyck Brooks.

There is small need any longer for prolegomena to a study of Melville. Much of what Mr. Lanzinger writes of the biography and of Melville's vicissitudes has been so often heard as to be repetitious without reason. Furthermore, some of his judgments of major American authors, sweeping from Irving onward over no more than two or three pages of discussion, are irrelevant to his undertaking. But the real problem of the critic who confronts Melville seems here to have been minimized. The subject elected is a vast one. It cannot be fully explored unless there is first a critical recognition of the fact that primitivism and naturalism in Melville are not pure strains but contain within themselves paradoxes and contradictions presumed by this critic to be resolved in the meeting and intertwining of the two.

What is to be done, for instance, with the contradictions apparent in Melville's primitivism embodied in Queequeg of *Moby-Dick*? Mr. Lanzinger recognizes this renowned and most unlikely savage in certain of his aspects which fit the thesis. The chapter called "The Counterpane" (*Moby-Dick*, IV) is cited as Melville's testament to the demoniacal of the primitive which as a dark consciousness endlessly threatens civilized man (p. 59). Queequeg is the spectre of a frightful and savage past. But what is to be said of Melville's paradoxical scenes of Queequeg in other guises: his pledge of fraternal love to Ishmael (ch. XI) with thirty dollars in silver, in ironical recollection of the thirty pieces by which Christ was betrayed; or Queequeg in prospect of death, mild and calm, his eyes "rounding and rounding, like the rings of Eternity" (ch. CX)? Excluding from his discussion Melville's reflection upon the nature of religious experience and of love in the human condition as well as a concern with symbolic form, Mr. Lanzinger does not tell us about such paradoxes.

*Connecticut College*

JAMES BAIRD

**Louise Cowan, *The Fugitive Group. A Literary History* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State Univ. Press, 1959. xxiii + 277 pp. 8 plates. \$5.00).** A HISTORY of the Fugitive group had to come, whether or not they are as a group "unmatched in American Literature," as Mrs. Cowan asserts. No doubt it is fortunate that the historian was able to do her work when her subjects were still available for consultation, but as any good literary historian knows, memories of events and relationships are usually blurred: antagonisms are mitigated by time, and finely wrought distinctions and qualifications disappear in recollection. What Mrs. Cowan has done with something of the affection of a disciple but with more of the objectivity of a scholar is to go beyond the memories of the Fugitives to the actual documents and letters that reveal the past, in this instance, about as clearly as it may ever be revealed. And what letters she has had to work with! In this day of easy communication it is difficult to imagine even committed men of letters devoting themselves so urgently to the task of writing each other as did the Fugitives. The correspondence of John Crowe Ransom, Allen Tate, Donald Davidson, and Robert Penn Warren must ultimately be published, but until it is, Mrs. Cowan's history will be an invaluable source not only for the personal relationships of these significant literary figures but also for the beginnings of a mode of literary criticism that seems to be as viable as any.

Mrs. Cowan has skillfully blended the material of these letters with the public documents—the files of *The Fugitive*, the records of the Vanderbilt University Registrar, the student publications of the University—to give a lively and convincing account of the formation of the group on the Vanderbilt campus, the flavor of their discussions, and the conception and publication of *The Fugitive* during its three years of existence (1922-1925). She effectively explodes the hoary myth that the Fugitives were so unified in their theories and attitudes that the magazine was in effect a single voice (certain reviewers once thought Ransom responsible for the whole publication). Actually the differences were so sharply defined that the record of the magazine reads almost like a drama, with protagonist and antagonist. One wonders whether Tate, the proponent of modernism, will win his battle against the traditionalists within the group. As a rule the disagreements concerned purely literary matters (the use of language, the nature of the theme, the strategy of meaning); but the Fugitives were so seriously concerned with the problems of poetry that their dis-

agreement might have intensified into open warfare with subsequent personal estrangement had not they felt for each other the kind of affection and mutual respect that tolerates dispute.

Another part of the record that Mrs. Cowan clears has to do with the transformation from Fugitive to Agrarian. Only four of the group became Agrarians. They had all had their beginnings in philosophical inquiry, which led to the search for an aesthetic discipline, in turn to an examination of the poet's craft, and finally, in the case of Ransom, Davidson, Tate and Warren, to an exploration of tradition. In this, these four, who are acknowledged the most accomplished and dedicated of the Fugitives, found their common ground; and this common ground took the form of what Mrs. Cowan calls "the ethical and religious (though still, for them, primarily literary) movement that was known as Agrarianism." Thus "it was only through breaking with 'Southern literature,' as it was then piously conceived, that they could find the way to what they realized years later was the genuine Southern tradition."

In the implication of the phrase above we find our only quarrel with Mrs. Cowan's history. Her assumption as to the nature of the Southern tradition is based largely upon the statements of the Fugitive-Agrarians. Perhaps the Southern society did provide for the group "a code of manners and morals, with its underlying *gentillesse* . . ." Perhaps the South did think of itself "as a continuation of the main stream of classical humanism." But the South has had many faces, and this shows us but one. Even though the Fugitives (particularly the gentle ironist, John Ransom) may exhibit some of the finest qualities of the tradition they extol, there is some question as to whether it is *the* Southern tradition. What *the* tradition is we can scarcely say, but we can wish that Mrs. Cowan had preserved her historian's objectivity to the extent of granting that what she describes was the tradition the Fugitive-Agrarians, in terms of their philosophical and religious commitments, were almost compelled to discover, and that it is not necessarily the "genuine Southern tradition."

*University of Kentucky*

ROBERT D. JACOBS

**Frederick L. Gwynn and Joseph L. Blotner, editors, *Faulkner in the University* (Charlottesville, Virginia: The University of Virginia Press, 1959. xi + 294 pp. \$6.00). Robert Penn Warren, *Selected Essays* (New York: Random House, 1959. xiii + 305 pp. \$4.00).** WHEN the creative writer assumes the role of critic, whether as commentator on his own writings or as formal analyst of other literature, the response of readers will be diverse. Some hold that a poet is the best qualified critic of poetry, others believe that the combination of both talents in one man is rare indeed. Far more widespread are two other opinions. One is that the development of fine critical abilities conflicts with the artist's creative powers (and authors like Dryden, Coleridge, and Arnold will be cited in evidence); the other is that the artist is particularly inept in criticizing his own writings (and though Poe can be cited as a glaring example among many, Henry James is a notable case in disproof). The two books under review will inevitably raise these issues.

Throughout a long career William Faulkner has been one of the most reticent of living authors, but in recent years he has relaxed this strict control over his privacy and allowed himself to be interviewed in various ways. The two most voluminous of these occasions were his "conversations" at a seminar in Japan, published in 1957, and the present volume recording his answers to student questions during informal meetings in 1957 and 1958 when he was Writer-in-Residence at the University of Virginia. In none of these semi-public utterances has Faulkner set himself up as a critic, far from it. Being pressed by ardent admirers for comments on his works, he has simply responded with a flow of talk that is well worth preserving for a number of reasons—especially his free and easy talk with the Virginia students. The editors were faced with several problems that called for sound judgment, and their solutions seem on the whole quite sensible. One of these entailed the decision to cut repetitious and occasionally trivial matter from 40,000 feet of tape recordings so as to bring the book down to reasonable size. On the assumption that this selective editing has not in any way changed the emphasis or distorted the meaning of these conversations, the reader can only be grateful. Another problem concerned the possible re-ordering of material which followed the haphazard course of informal question-and-answer periods. But after trying a topical arrangement for the benefit of the reader, they decided that "the order most faithful to the fact and spirit of the sessions" would be the actual one. So readers must accommodate themselves

to this non-sequential flow of questions and answers, though they can link together comments on any given work or subject by making use of the full and adequate index. Inconvenient as this may be it was wise, because any editorial re-arrangement would have been unfair to Faulkner by giving the impression that his comments were meditated and organized, whereas they were given off-the-cuff in the most literal sense.

After sampling some fifty pages, to recreate the spirit of these conversations, this reader then turned to the index and ran down all the passages dealing with *Absalom*, *The Sound and the Fury*, "Was," the Negro, the North, and other fictions and facts that seemed promising. The result was rewarding in a twofold way. By following the questions and answers as they actually occurred, through half-a-dozen class meetings, one is duly warned about the limitations of such occasions (the intelligence of the questioners; the lack of sequence, repetitiousness, and frequent triviality of the questions; the mood of the author under fire on a particular day) and yet reassured of the honesty and seriousness of the participants. By linking the scattered comments according to subject, one is surprised at the amount of light shed on the author's craft of fiction and his world view by such random discussion. What emerges as a total picture is Faulkner's integrity as both man and artist, his ready wit as well as his basic humanism, and if not a profound analysis of his works at least a great many curious and interesting sidelights on them. No author's commentary on his own works can take the place of objective criticism, and Faulkner was quick to recognize that. In answer to the specific question, "Do you think it's particularly rewarding for students to read the critics of your work?" he replied, "I should think so." The critic, he added, "has a valid function, a very important function," and he urged upon these students the value of that criticism which he himself does not have time to read. Moreover, those older "students" who have aspired to be professional critics of Faulkner will find much to their purposes in this informal record of conversations between a great artist and his youthful audience.

The critical essays of Robert Penn Warren, now first published in volume form, are a very different matter. The ten here selected confirm the impression many of us have had over the years, that he is one of those rare creative authors who also possesses the talents of a first-rate critic. Most of them deal with important contemporaries, two with greats from the last century, but none with his own

work—unless we take the single general essay on “Pure and Impure Poetry” to be a presentation of his personal aesthetic, and hence related to his practice as a poet as well as to his theory. This initial critique is an ambitious one, attempting to get at the essence of poetry, especially lyric poetry, within the space of thirty pages. The dialectic is worked out in a contrast between the representative poetry of the seventeenth and twentieth centuries on the one hand and the poetry of the “romantics” on the other. The latter are the chief examples given of the attempt to write “pure” poetry, that is, poems which exclude the prosaic imperfections of this world: argument, worry, cacophonies, cliches, self-contradictions, realism, and so on. The exponents of pure poetry are many and conflicting, he admits, and some effort is made to survey them. But to simplify the discussion he finds one doctrine central to them all, namely, that “ideas are not involved in the poetic effect, and may even be inimical to it.” In making out his case against this kind of poetry, he uses Poe, Shelley, Tennyson, and their defenders for the whipping boys, as usual. And in arriving at a definition of the poetry he most admires, that of Marvell and Ransom flanked by Shakespeare and Dante, he is of course defending the kind that he himself and his most distinguished contemporaries are writing. But though this juxtaposing of opposites is old hat now, the aesthetic and metaphysical arguments by which it is worked out in this essay are novel and provocative. He is not content with affirming that ideas should participate in the poetic effect, but shows effectively how they do so. Neither these nor any other “imperfections” can be excluded from good poems, which make use of everything in human experience that is available and functional for the particular poem. The recalcitrant materials are involved in the total structure as resistances to be overcome, so that the poem may earn its meaning instead of merely stating it, or dispensing with it altogether. This essay is placed first, one suspects, because it is central to Warren’s convictions about the techniques of literature. And the volume is brought to a close by his now famous reading of Coleridge’s *Ancient Mariner*, a hundred-page essay on the mode of the imagination, the role of symbol and myth in creating great poetry.

These two full-scale pronouncements form the frame and the point of reference for the essays that lie between. For though six of the other eight deal with fictions, these fictions are evaluated largely in terms of the same aesthetic principles. Katherine Porter’s stories are shown to have their center in irony, Eudora Welty’s in their thematic balance of love and loneliness. Faulkner and Conrad are praised for

their successful fusion of idea and feeling and their dramatic handling of all the self-contradictions of the human situation. Hemingway's great talent is defined as a disciplined control over his lyricism that gives a special intensity to his vision of the modern world, and Thomas Wolfe's great flaw as his lack of such discipline. The two remaining essays are on poets, Melville and Frost, and though the effort to make out a case for the former is something of a tour de force, the tribute to Frost goes far towards restoring him to his rightful place as one of the most authentic voices of our century, in terms of the "impure" poetry discussed at some length above.

In his preface Warren modestly disclaims any systematic "method" for his criticisms, and then wittily denigrates the idea that a systematic criticism would even be desirable by comparing it to a "gigantic IBM machine . . . into which deft fingers of filing clerks feed poems and plays and novels and stories, like punched cards." But in spite of this he does have a method, as readers of his textbooks would be led to expect—a close reading of the text with equal attention to techniques and substance, on the premise that the two are one and inseparable. His essays may aim at an overall assessment of each author's achievement, but he does not simply let his sensibility play over his reading like an irresponsible amateur. There is discipline as well as insight, detailed explications to support his instinctive good taste in literature. He is at his best when evaluating what he most admires, especially when it is the work of fellow Southerners whom he best understands. Readers who have set considerable store by Warren's critical essays as they appeared in the magazines will be grateful to have the best of them collected and more readily available. And reviewing them in a single volume, one is inclined to claim for him a higher rank as a critic than heretofore. But noting their dates—all but one fall in the decade from 1941 to 1951—we may wonder if the development of this skill has had anything to do with the falling off of his own fictions from his peak achievement in *All the King's Men* (1946). Has the creator become too self-conscious and articulate about the techniques of his craft?

*Johns Hopkins University*

CHARLES ANDERSON

**Margaret Gilman, *The Idea of Poetry in France. From Houdar de la Motte to Baudelaire* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1958. xi + 324 pp. \$6.00).** MARGARET Gilman's book

is partly an essay written by a lover of poetry and partly a historical study. There are happy moments when the two approaches blend, but there are others when they diverge. The result of this divergence is by no means always negative.

The lover of poetry has, quite naturally, definite likes and dislikes: certain poems, a certain conception of what constitutes a poem, a certain evaluation of poetry and of the poet, certain ideas of the specific faculties and gifts that form a poet seem true and valid to Margaret Gilman, and others seem decidedly false or only partly correct. The historian of literature, on the other hand, feels the duty of objectivity and balanced judgment. There are sections in the present book where strong predilection influences the historical exposé.

A work dealing predominantly with the *idea* of poetry invites the question as to whether it is valid and fair to evaluate this idea on the basis of theoretical statements or treatises. Margaret Gilman does not dodge the issue and finds a solution in the conviction that there exists "a fairly close connection between the poet's practice and his theory" (vii). This means in terms of method that she will deal primarily with "what the poets themselves thought and wrote about poetry" (*ibid.*). The assumption is fair and the method seems to be sound. However, the issue is in reality more complex. There is the poetic theory of the poet who reflects on poetry, and there is the poetics of the creative poet, a poetics either inserted into the poem, becoming part of it or accompanying it in the form of intuitions, sudden insights that are still connected with the birth of the poem. The two kinds of "theory" do not always agree, and the latter can be found only by an analysis of the poems. Margaret Gilman shows a predominant concern for the first kind of theory and very rarely analyzes a poem for its 'immanent' poetics.

The complexity of the relationship between poetry and poetic theory appears still in another way. Margaret Gilman entitles her first chapter "The Nadir of Poetry" and designates by this term the period of the end of the seventeenth century and a large section of the eighteenth. According to the theme and stated aim of the book, one would have expected as title: The Nadir of the Idea of Poetry. The reading of the chapter explains why Margaret Gilman chose the title which she uses: in the period under discussion the idea of poetry is by no means dead. Despite several currents that were hostile to it, we find excellent theories concerning poetry and the specific gifts of the poet. Yet there is no great poetry, or as Margaret Gilman insists,

there is only very poor poetry, and none of those who formulated these ideas was a poet. Diderot, who according to the author had a deep knowledge of the nature of poetry and developed a highly original and significant critical theory that announces Baudelaire (he is the only one to share with Baudelaire the honor of a separate chapter), lived and wrote during the period of the nadir of poetry. As a result of this disproportion between poetry and the idea of poetry, the chapter is, as it were, off balance. The author repeatedly complains about the low esteem in which poetry and the poet's talent and rôle are held and yet quotes magnificent insights into the nature of poetry and poetic genius.

The author also seems to feel that "true," "real," "great" poetry is written only in periods in which we find a metaphysical, semi-religious conception of the poet and poetry. This principle, which seems to me rather doubtful, explains probably why Margaret Gilman deals with the seventeenth century in a summary fashion. There are still other reasons for this unfavorable treatment, reasons which we shall discuss later. We mention the case of seventeenth-century poetry here only because it illustrates the danger of deriving general principles of investigation from a period—in the present case the nineteenth century—when partly as a result of a long preparation of esthetic theory and critical vocabulary, poetry and poetic theory were closely related. One may, of course, also disagree with Margaret Gilman's low esteem of eighteenth-century poetry and wish that this judgment, repeated all too often and for all too long, be revised by an unprejudiced study of that poetry; but these considerations lead away from the perspective chosen by the author. We must, however, discuss Margaret Gilman's strong preferences in poetry with regard to the question of the structure of her book.

The lofty conception of the poet and of poetry in the sixteenth century and some nineteenth-century poetry, particularly Baudelaire's poems and poetic theory, represent the two high points in Margaret Gilman's book. Between the two there is a gradual descent and after the lowest point, a slow, difficult ascent. Stated in terms of poetic genres, lyric poetry ranks first for Margaret Gilman; stated in terms of the nature of poetry, the perfect poem is for her the one in which matter and form are fused into one, in which the visible and invisible are united, in which language becomes suggestive magic. Baudelaire achieved this miracle in his symbolic poetry, as he also, in his theories, recognized the essential problems of poetics and their solution: the

relation of poetry to truth and morals, the relationship between art and reality, between matter and form, between imagination and technique. At the opposite end of "The Nadir of Poetry" is "Imagination Enthroned: Baudelaire."

The perfect candor, the radiant conviction with which Margaret Gilman states her admiration, the almost religious fervor that animate her thought and style whenever she finds "true" poetry and "true" insight into poetry have something disarming. One may object that there is other poetry than lyric poetry, that there are other ways of blending matter and form than Baudelaire's symbolic poetry, that the low esteem of eloquence and rhetoric is a prerogative of writers, critics and readers having grown up among the wonders of English poetry and poetics, a prerogative that one must renounce if one crosses the Channel, but one feels that Margaret Gilman would have listened politely to these and similar objections, would have recognized their relative value, and reaffirmed her faith. The present reviewer is therefore unwilling to challenge Margaret Gilman's strong likes and dislikes which she transformed into clear knowledge of poetry and poetic genius. He accepts the choice of a wise and lucid lover of poetry. With regard to the historian of literature, however, he cannot refrain from making some reservations.

Margaret Gilman does not only trace the curve of descent and ascent of the idea of poetry from the sixteenth century to Baudelaire, but she also wishes to show that Baudelaire's poetry and poetic theory do not represent a total break with a previous tradition nor mark the very starting point of modern poetry. Baudelaire remains an innovator; his poetry is a unique achievement, but it had been prepared by a long development. This the author shows by a study of the evaluation of poetry and the poet during the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, more specifically by the changes in the concept of nature (external and human nature), the re-evaluation of feeling (as opposed to reason), of inspiration, genius and poetic experience as well as of the poet's specific faculties, above all imagination, and of the forms of poetry: verse, rhyme, image, symbol. We have already mentioned the broader issues of the relationship between art and reality, matter and form, imitation (or description) versus metaphorical expression, statement versus suggestion. On all these points Margaret Gilman makes many excellent, pertinent and original observations. She deliberately tried—and generally succeeded—to present this evolution in terms of poetics and esthetics and to avoid the

approach of a historian of ideas. Still, the very concept of an evolution reaching a zenith (Baudelaire's form and idea of poetry) through various stages introduces a teleological idea and a set of definite values into the course of the history of poetic forms and themes, and this brings us back into the domain of philosophy and history of ideas. Since Baudelaire's art and theories are moreover interpreted as a synthesis of formerly separate or opposed conceptions, Margaret Gilman's perspective comes even close to that of a dialectical scheme. The positive values which we enumerated above have their counterpart in negative ones (e. g. reason, general norms, imitation, description, image as ornament, formalism, social and moral utility of poetry and the poet). The various authors, their art and their thought are fitted into this evolutionary pattern; they are not only measured by their proximity to the established criteria, but they are also taken into consideration only in so far as their work and their ideas correspond to these criteria. No attempt is made to understand them on their own grounds and in their own right, or to explain their ideas and art in connection with social, political or economic factors. Diderot receives special attention since he is said to announce Baudelaire's poetic theory. He is presented like the prophet in the desert who in a vision anticipates the poetry to come. Joubert almost comes in for second honors as a prophet. It is obvious that the dominant perspective deeply influences the interpretation and even the very selection and combination of passages from the various authors.

The dangers to which this construction leads are evident, and if they are not too numerous and grave in the present book, it is entirely due to Margaret Gilman's artistic sensitivity, sound literary scholarship and thorough knowledge of poetry which again and again act as a corrective of the evolutionary scheme. It is true that her criteria are biased, but they manifest essential esthetic values and high standards of poetic excellency.

Some detailed observations: the "classical doctrine" is presented much more rigidly, rationally and mechanically than it is, and no justice is done to poetic theory or poetry in the seventeenth century; the 'immanent' theories are totally neglected, although they are of great interest with several poets (Théophile de Viau, for instance). The reason for this evaluation seems to lie in Margaret Gilman's conviction that "pure" or "great" poetry is lyric poetry and, as we remarked before, that there exists a link between great poetry and an elevated conception of its value and the poet's mission. Evidently

the seventeenth century did not maintain the lofty ideas concerning Parnassus which the previous century had held. This sober attitude was, however, very wholesome and led towards the end of the seventeenth and in the eighteenth century ("the nadir of poetry") to the very important philosophical analysis of esthetic concepts, an analysis without which nineteenth-century esthetics is unthinkable. The bombast about the celestial fire, the divine enthusiasm, the prophetic poet, Parnassus and its inhabitants had to be abandoned before new meaning (or simply: meaning) could be attached to esthetic terms. There exists an essential link between esthetics and epistemology in the eighteenth century, and one cannot write the history of imagination-memory-sentiment-reason-image, and symbol (hiéroglyphe) without a careful study of the philosophic development of those terms. After a good but all too summary beginning (some remarks on Hobbes, Locke, Condillac, Hume, Berkeley), Margaret Gilman abandons this line of her investigation. In the case of Diderot's ideas on poetry and the talents or faculties that constitute the poet, the philosophical and scientific tradition are of primary importance. Margaret Gilman's chapter on Diderot is admirable in many respects, but it interprets Diderot too much from the point of view of Baudelaire's theories. The link which she establishes between widely scattered passages does not always exist in Diderot's mind, the perspective in which the passages are placed is determined by the *entelechia* Baudelaire, and the context in which the passages appear in Diderot's works is often not mentioned. Some of these passages are part of strictly philosophic speculation and must be placed in a philosophic tradition; others, often the most important ones, are stated with regard to the plastic arts; they can be used only by analogy for Diderot's idea of poetry. More attention should have been given to the differences that separate Diderot and Baudelaire; it is true that both transform the narrow precept of *imitatio naturae* into the comprehensive question of the relation between art and reality, but the conception of nature and of reality is not the same with the two authors.

We have gone into these details in order to give concrete examples of our general critical observations. Other examples, particularly with regard to Joubert and Victor Hugo, could be added, but they would prolong this review beyond all reasonable limits and make it appear unduly critical. Margaret Gilman's book leads to the center of the formation of modern poetic theory; it is of great assistance

to the student of esthetics and is a guide for all readers of poetry who, to paraphrase a saying by Baudelaire which was dear to Margaret Gilman, wish to transform the response of their heart and senses into knowledge.

*Harvard University*

HERBERT DIECKMANN

**Stendhal, *De l'Amour*, ed., Henri Martineau (Paris: Garnier, 1959. xxix + 521 pp. 7 plates. Classiques Garnier).** STENDHAL considered *De l'Amour* his principal work, but he admitted that it contained many elliptical passages. The present edition not only brings out the importance of *De l'Amour* among Stendhal's works. It also elucidates most of the obscurities that disconcerted the readers of the original edition. Since 1822 several critical editions of the essay have been published. Among them one should not forget the one by Émile Henriot in the collection "Selecta" of the Classiques Garnier (1924). It contains a valuable introduction and includes the *inédits* published by Mérimée and Romain Colomb in their edition (Paris: Michel Lévy, 1853). In 1926 Daniel Muller and Pierre Jourda brought out a two-volume edition of *De l'Amour*, with an important "Préface" by Étienne Rey. In keeping with the high standard set by the other volumes of the Champion collection of Stendhal's works, the "Notes et éclaircissements" are erudite, pertinent, and copious. But Stendhal scholars are extremely active and it was fitting that their leader, the late Henri Martineau, should bring out an edition of *De l'Amour* that can be considered, at least for many years, definitive. This is the critical edition published by Henri Martineau in 1957. The Garnier edition is based practically entirely on it. The main differences are a new "Avertissement," the omission of the fragment composed by Beyle in 1803 and entitled "Du caractère des femmes françaises," and the omission of the rough draft of a novel in which Beyle planned to depict his unhappy love affair with Météilde Dembowski. It is regrettable that the "Table des noms cités" of the 1957 edition is not included.

No Stendhalian was more competent to write an introduction to *De l'Amour* than Henri Martineau, the author of *Le Cœur de Stendhal*. In his "Avertissement" he rightly stresses the confessional aspect of the essay and gives a concise account of its genesis. He also points out that *De l'Amour* contradicts categorically the allegation that Henri Beyle was "un cœur sec, un jouisseur égoïste, un libertin cynique."

The "Notes de l'Amour" and the "Notes des compléments," 792 in number, are identical with those of the 1957 edition. The "Notes des annexes," 793 to 814, refer to the reviews that Stendhal himself wrote to try to push the sale of his treatise.

The text follows that of the only edition published during the lifetime of the author (Paris: Mongie, 1822). Correction of obvious mistakes in the original edition (see, for instance, notes 348 and 717), slight changes in punctuation, and a modernized spelling are the only modifications made by the editor. Whenever possible, however, Henri Martineau writes out in square brackets proper names or words which, for the sake of prudence, Stendhal had indicated only by the first letter. Variations based on the Bucci, Guiraudet, and Gougy-Sardou copies of *De l'Amour* (these are references to the owners or successive owners), annotated by Stendhal, are included in the "Notes," which incorporate all the pertinent discoveries made by Stendhal scholars since the publication of the original edition. They are not simply factual. They reflect Henri Martineau's perceptive appreciation of Stendhal's *sensibilité* and thought. The editor also shows the importance of *De l'Amour* in relation to the novels. Cross references are a helpful device. Whenever necessary, the correct reading of Stendhal's quotations is supplied, and all foreign words or passages are correctly translated. Martineau is also careful not to affirm when there is any doubt (as, in note 316, p. 454, when he is discussing the identity of the comtesse Kalenberg). It should be mentioned too that due credit is given, in all cases, to Stendhal scholars who have been of help to the editor.

In spite of the discoveries made by Martineau and other scholars, a certain number of allusions and problems remain mysterious or unsolved. These will provide a happy hunting ground for future Stendhalians. It is somewhat surprising that Henri Martineau, who indicates so many borrowings from Chamfort, should have failed to point out that the statement, ". . . je croirais assez qu'un homme qui porte un nom historique est plus disposé qu'un autre à mettre le feu à une ville pour se faire cuire un œuf" (ch. lix, p. 234) is Stendhal's clever version of Chamfort's anecdote: "Quelqu'un disait d'un homme très-personnel: il brûlerait votre maison pour se faire cuire deux œufs." In chapter xxxix bis, "Remèdes à l'amour," Stendhal states: "Je ne dis rien de l'orgueil, remède cruel et souverain, mais qui n'est pas à l'usage des âmes tendres." This is probably inspired by the following observation in Scott's *Waverley* (ch. xlivi): "Pride, which

92  
es  
elf  
he  
us  
( ),  
he  
er,  
ds  
ne  
y-  
or  
ne  
by  
ey  
ve  
so  
ss  
et  
ls  
to  
is  
pe  
al  
s,  
or  
re  
o  
o  
ui  
u  
s  
e  
x  
:  
t  
e  
h  
8 supplies its caustic as an useful, though severe, remedy for the wounds of affection, came rapidly to his [Waverley's] aid." Other sources could be cited. But as Valéry aptly formulates it: "On n'en finirait plus avec Stendhal."

The printing leaves little to be desired. There are very few broken letters and only two cases, to our knowledge, in which the type needs moving or aligning (pp. 46 and 383). The following misprints have been noted: *Carolin* for *Caroline* (p. 75), *connu* for *connue* (p. 154). The *l* in *l'édition* has been omitted (note 321) and a comma left out after *Blois* (n. 319). The *p* and the *r* of *premier* (p. 51) should be closed up.

*De l'Amour* is a welcome and valuable addition to the Garnier collection. The jacket, with David's medallion of Henri Beyle, and the seven illustrations, including the presumed portrait of Météilde Dembowski, enhance the attractiveness of the volume.

*The University of Georgia*

JULES C. ALCIATORE

**Sœur Marie-Margarita, S.N.D., *La Métrique de Francis Jammes* (Boston: Spaulding-Moss, Cie.; 1959. iii + 226 pp. \$3.85).** CE travail, nous dit l'auteur, fut terminé en 1954. Elle n'a donc pu tenir compte de l'étude de Monique Parent: *Rythme et Versification dans la poésie de Francis Jammes* (1957). L'auteur analyse des poèmes de Jammes et des poèmes-témoins de prédécesseurs et de contemporains. Elle s'intéresse non seulement à la métrique, mais aussi au jeu des voyelles. L'étude comporte même un chapitre sur la langue. On y trouve un tableau où sont comparées les proportions des termes abstraits, affectifs et perceptifs chez plusieurs poètes. Il est piquant de constater que le taux du vocabulaire abstrait est de 16% chez Verlaine et de 11% chez Valéry.

La grammaire de l'auteur m'a souvent paru insolite: hasard des accords, passion pour le subjonctif et la voix pronominale, et d'autres surprises. Ici et là des corrections n'ont pas été faites: la dernière strophe de "Bateau ivre" commence avec un *si* inopportun (p. 35); l'unanimisme devient "unanism" (p. 104); la date de publication des *Poèmes saturniens* est 1869 p. 7, mais revient à 1866 p. 37. J'ai relevé en revanche une image suggestive: "le lasso du très-saint rosaire" (p. 82). J'imagine, tableau surréaliste, une *Vierge au lasso*. Mais le fait que je vois là une trouvaille trahit peut-être simplement

mon ignorance de la langue et des méthodes des missionnaires du Nouveau Monde.

Il me paraît dommage que les textes des poèmes ne figurent pas auprès des diagrammes où sont analysés le rythme et le jeu des voyelles. Ceux-ci sont présentés à la file dans la seconde moitié de l'ouvrage. Les exigences matérielles de l'édition ont sans doute déterminé cette disposition.

En ce qui concerne le rythme, la scansion peut donner lieu à des divergences. Examinant le vers "Correct, ridicule et charmant," l'auteur de l'étude compte "ridicule et" comme une mesure et pose un accent secondaire sur *di* (p. 38). Je ne suis pas d'accord. Dans le vers "Pour ce beau corps blanc comme un tapis de lilas," je placerais une coupe après *comme*, à la différence de l'auteur. Pour le vers "Un bateau frêle comme un papillon de mai," j'opérerais de même, d'accord ici avec l'auteur. Disons d'ailleurs que la notion de coupe paraît grossière lorsqu'on n'a pas affaire à un vers nettement frappé.

En ce qui concerne le jeu des voyelles, il me semble qu'il y a du bon dans le système appliqué par l'auteur. Il s'agit du système de Grammont, lequel a été assoupli, mais non supplanté. D'un autre côté il faut bien voir que si le principe de concordance entre unites mélodiques et rythmiques a quelque valeur heuristique pour le vers isolé, il n'en a plus pour le poème: une séquence de vers trop mécaniquement harmonieux peut être pénible. Notons aussi que, selon ce principe, l'harmonie d'un vers dépend de la manière dont on le scande. Ainsi l'auteur coupe 4-3-5 le vers suivant: "Le filet d'eau qui s'écoule de cette tuile," ce qui le fait paraître gauche et inharmonieux. Mais, au lieu d'une coupe enjambante (s'écou-le), on peut opter pour une coupe lyrique (s'écou-*e*). On obtient ainsi un trimètre régulier et une certaine concordance entre rythme et voyelles. Pour ce faire, il faut admettre une dérogation au principe selon lequel la dernière syllabe de l'unité rythmique doit être accentuée. Le choix de la coupe lyrique s'accorderait avec une prononciation occitane.

Ce qui soulève une autre question: la traduction phonétique doit-elle tenir compte des particularités de prononciation du poète? On pourrait proposer ce principe: la meilleure version d'un poème particulier est celle qui lui confère le plus d'harmonie. Mais c'est là refuser les prémisses d'une traduction phonétique uniforme.

Autre point: l'analyse du jeu des voyelles suffit-elle à nous donner la formule de l'harmonie d'un vers? Voyelles et consonnes ne sont pas indépendantes. De deux vers de même schéma vocalique et ryth-

mique, mais de schémas consonantiques différents, l'un peut être bien plus heureux que l'autre. Davantage: la valeur syntaxique, sans parler de la valeur sémantique, peut réagir sur la valeur phonique. La facture racinienne est considérée comme l'une des plus harmonieuses. Mais l'indigence grammaticale des rimes (deux infinitifs, deux participes passés, etc.), liée à la monotonie syntaxique, rend exaspérante pour certains cette fameuse musique racinienne qui, chez d'autres, déclenche encore, du moins théoriquement, force pâmoisons.

Cette étude sur Jammes suscite bien des questions. C'est là déjà un intérêt. De telles analyses fournissent une base de discussion et de développements assez sûre et appropriée. Elles nous rappellent que l'œuvre poétique n'est pas faite de choses, ni même de mots, mais de vocables. Il faut rendre hommage au travail considérable dont témoignent les diagrammes et reconnaître l'utilité de telles études préliminaires.

L'auteur ne se proposait pas un exposé proprement esthétique. En dehors des analyses mentionnées, elle note certaines caractéristiques de la poésie de Jammes, mais ces caractéristiques ne sont pas esthétiques: par exemple la connaissance du milieu dont cette poésie témoigne. De toute manière, il faut bien dire que le sujet était pauvre. Il y a de jolis détails chez Jammes, mais il n'est guère parvenu à dégager une sensibilité seconde, esthétique, de la sensibilité première, quotidienne.

*Indiana University*

R. CHAMPIGNY

**Juan Bautista Avalle-Arce, *La Novela Pastoril Española* (Madrid: Revista de Occidente, 1959. xi + 248 pp.).** THE author, disciple of the late Amado Alonso, and known from his sound Cervantes studies e. g. "La canción desesperada de Grisóstomo," *NRFH*, xi (1957), 193-8; "Conocimiento y vida en Cervantes," *Filología*, v (1959), 1-34, starts from the *escrutinio* of the pastoral novels in the library of Don Quijote to build up a truly critical history of the pastoral novel in Spain. His study satisfies the history of ideas as well as the history of literary esthetics. His painstaking search for and handling of sources, his rich and to the point quotations and their skilful interpretation, his discrete use of a well studied extensive secondary literature, his covering of remote and never analyzed pastoral specimina make this book a welcome and precious gift to the hispanist.

Sannazaro having influenced only the later Spanish pastoral novels, the source elements in the very original *Diana* of Montemayor (1559) have been detected in specific passages of chivalrous novels (Olivante de Laura; Lisuarte de Grecia; Don Florisel de Niquea) and older dramatic and lyrical forms (pastourelles), particularly in Spain herself (Encina, Garcilaso, Ausías March). All these authors create *un ensimismamiento agridulce*. But the spirit of the *Diana* has to be looked for in the neoplatonism of Leone Ebreo's *Dialoghi d'Amore*. The cravings of a carefree aristocratic society which tries to liberate itself also from the handicaps of a moral life by the dream of an edenic static society where only one occupation exists: loving and talking endlessly of casuistic possibilities of human love as a harmless-erotic relaxation in a divinized nature, coalesce in Montemayor's masterpiece to a meaningful Renaissance-myth, i. e. "una pastorilización de la realidad." The moral standards of the Counterreformation however break this neopagan utopic and timeless idyll and change the mythic into a time-bound and space-bound shepherd with "cayado, zurrón, abarcas, perros," whose existence is threatened by jealousy, violence and death. With these ingredients and a structural amplification Alonso Pérez, in his *Diana*, definitely analyzes his shepherds as to the powers of the soul in Aristotelian, Thomistic fashion, stresses passion and sin and considers love a sickness of the soul. The *Diana Enamorada* of Gil Polo, may be called for similar reasons a *socialización* of the *pastorilización* of life. Love appears here in the neoscholastic trend as a dangerous form of concupiscence nourished by vain thoughts of idle people. The shepherds and shepherdesses trying to direct their will by reason to virtue, and stressing the sacredness of the marriage bond, lose their contours as half-gods and nymphs and become aristocratic ladies and gentlemen with *moral* responsibilities, belong to minutely described landscapes of Spain where rivers and hills have concrete names and where the problem of a sociologically reasonable occupation arises. Jerónimo de Tejeda, rewriting the Novel of Montemayor with elements of the *Quijote* has already destroyed the pastoral genre by an anecdotic novel of the *cortesano* type where not *la naturaleza* but *el Cielo* governs the destinies.

These elements, by a progressing rationalizing and moralizing trend drag the pastoral aspects into the sphere of the autobiographical novel, cast into the more "event-ful" form of the historic-individual byzantine novel (Luis Gálvez de Montalvo, *El Pastor de Filida*, a "novela

de clave," a "roman à clef"; Lope de Vega, *Arcadia*, "una pastoril-monstrua," bristling with erudition). Another way out of the dilemma is the opposite tendency, namely: centering around a "naturaleza ajardinada," an actionless and misplaced lyricism and didacticism (Antonio de Lofrasso, *La Fortuna de amor*, a geographical and linguistic instruction; Gaspar Mercader, *El Prado de Valencia*, an "antología lírica"; Jacinto de Espinel Adorno, *El premio de constancia*, 1620, a baroque sermon on "engaño y vanidad"). The Italian fashion of a kind of rhetorical pseudorealism is evident in Bernardo de Balbuena, *Siglo de oro en las selvas de Erífe*, 1608, or Cristóbal Suárez de Figueroa, *La constante Amarilis*. The worst Mannerism to destroy the genre, already reeling under the impact of the poetics of verisimilitude, comes in a more direct way from the militant Catholic reform which turns consciously, conscientiously and tastelessly shepherds into "pastores desengañados" and shepherdesses into pious ladies retreating to solitude or nuns to be (Bartolomé Ponce, *Clara Diana a lo divino*, Bernardo González de Bobadilla, *Las ninjas y pastores de Henares*). The technique called *a lo divino*, which has been studied thoroughly by Bruce Wardropper, spiritualizes and moralizes everything. Attractive shepherdesses appear as loose temptresses and are treated as vicious women to be despised rather than loved. The *carpe diem* changes to a *memento mori* and medieval allegory rises again in figures like *la pastora Caro* and *el mayoral Demonio*.

But there remains—ex ungue leonem!—Cervantes. It is he who timidly in the *Galatea*, clearly in the *Quijote* and in the *Coloquio de los perros*, ironically-critically, nay perspectivistically, and by a *movimiento pendular*, opposes the two worlds of ideal mythico-poetical pastores, (with *templos* and *sacerdotes*, justified by academic playfulness and aristocratic *disfraz*, a "fingida Arcadia") and of realistic *históricos cabreros*, with *iglesias*, *curas* and *médicos*. He produces without constraint a new *ars oppositorum* between life and literature, the modern novel of the hispanic "meta-realidad," grasping human life in its full complexity.

This necessarily truncated summation of a relevant book may at least have shown how Professor Avalle-Arce has achieved to combine literary history and literary criticism on a high level and with competence. Considering perhaps a bit too demonstratively all the trends of modern literary scholarship, Wölfflin's principle of the "open form" comes in on the wrong place. His baroque category of "open-

ness" is used to characterize some awkwardly unfinished plots of the typically Renaissance-surface-novel of Montemayor (p. 83). The Wölfflinian principles only work applied to literature if corresponding in their five-fold partition. Picking out only some of them or interpreting them at random was also the plight of Roaten and Sánchez-Escribano. The demonstration of the tectonic-symmetrical structure of the *Diana* given by Wardropper: *SPh*, XLVIII (1951), 126-144, excludes a symphonic "open" composition. I am not convinced either that the indirect toning down of the pastoral Renaissance myth by counterreformatory authors (Gil Polo) without stressing everywhere the religious implications of life, should be called "stoicism," the less so as since Angel Ganivet it has become a rather meaningless slogan for the *cosas de España*, and as the suggested historical influence of Pomponazzi, Telesio and Bruno on Gil Polo has not been established (p. 103). Likewise I find it misleading to call Montemayor's concept of love "Eros" and its moral-Thomistic concept of the Counterreformation *Agape*, following terms quite differently used by the Swedish theologian Nygren. And whoever calls the fusion of fiction and truth in the baroque novel "Literarization of Life" should give credit to Leo Spitzer who stressed this concept first and pertinently for the most typical case, Lope's *Dorotea*.

But no detail objection can invalidate the merit of Avalle-Arce's masterly approach as a whole to a worthwhile and now well illuminated sector of Spanish literature.

*Catholic University of America*

HELMUT HATZFELD

**Gerardo Moldenhauer and Raul Echauri, eds., *El Teatro del Barroco Alemán. Antología Bilingüe; Selección, Prólogo y Notas* (Rosario, Universidad Nacional del Litoral, Instituto de Filología: 1957. 143 pp.).** THIS bilingual anthology, a reflection of the recent intense interest in German baroque literature, proposes to make available for South American readers representative selections from seventeenth-century German drama. It is intended for the layman, not for the specialist. However, to provide a truly representative picture within the small compass of the present volume is, of course, a hopeless task. The excerpts, chosen (by Moldenhauer, who is also responsible for the introduction and notes) from the dramas of Opitz, Bidermann, Gryphius, Lohenstein and Hallmann are supposed to "ofrecer algunos significativos temas, motivos y medios estilísticos del teatro barroco

alemán." However, even when one takes into account the obvious restrictions upon such an attempt, it is difficult to understand how this objective may be accomplished by the selections presented. For example, the section of Gryphius's *Leo Arminius* is taken from the fifth scene of the third act. It excerpts a part of the conversation between Michael, Papias and the Guard, which, in itself presents only a side issue. The selection given in the anthology presents most of the trivial conversation, but breaks off just before the only important speech, the monologue "Das ist die große Nacht. . . ." Again, I am certain the uninitiated Spanish reader who knows only the excerpt given of *Cardenio und Celinde* would be more bewildered than enlightened. A few words from the editors to set the scene for each drama would have remedied this defect. On the other hand, Señor Pedro Squenz, while somewhat bizarre in his Spanish garb, catches the rollicking spirit of the original. That almost a third of the entire book (37 pages of 128 pages of text) is devoted to this one comedy, however, and that another 28 pages are given to *Horribilicribrifax* and *Die geliebte Dornrose* certainly distorts the picture of the century. Selections from the *Oratorienspiel* and/or the *Festspiel* might have been better advised, but the editor was obviously restricted by the books at his disposal (only DNL, DLE and a single *Hallescher Neudruck* are the sources).

The introduction, intended for a Spanish general public, presents only a series of generalizations. The translation, which "prefiere ser fiel, no aspirando a lograr valor literario," is accurate but for a few details, largely caused by a misunderstanding of antiquated expressions. (E. g. pp. 16-7, the sentence beginning "Hier, da ist das edle Herze, / So das meine mir zerbricht . . ." where "so" is a relative pronoun, is mistranslated "Aquí, aquí estará el noble corazón, en el caso de que rompa el mío.") Unfortunately, the typical baroque "Häufung" is occasionally lost by a too elegant translation (pp. 126-7 "Armselig" translated by "infeliz" and "desgraciado" in successive lines.)

The most disturbing aspect of the book, however, is its typography, which is incredibly bad. Errors are too numerous to be mentioned individually, but may be summed up under the headings of: paragraph repeated (p. 94), line out of place (p. 106), numerous misprints, Spanish punctuation at odd intervals (see pp. 36 and 54, where it is most disturbing to find inverted question marks and exclamation points in the midst of the German text.) Tildes are frequently

confused with the umlaut, and there is a lack of consistency in spacing and page make-up. Presumably this is the fault of the printer, but the editor must have received proofs and must bear the responsibility.

In the notes, Moldenhauer combines the more unattractive aspects of German pedantry with Spanish légèreté. Page references to the sources (to what purpose?) are painstakingly given, but frequently misplaced, and, when two editions are used, sometimes not identified. Footnotes, which are given "para facilitar su comprensión al lector de lengua española que suele conocer sólo el alto alemán moderno" are also inconsistent, viz. seventeenth-century usage which interchanges "für" and "vor" is noted no less than nineteen times in 63 pages, whereas antiquated or colloquial forms such as "Witzigung" and "Käsemutter" have no notes. References to the original form of a word in the sources are frequently inaccurate (e. g. p. 118, note 2b "Palm: Pfarr" and note 5 "Palm: Cöppelerei" should be "Palm: Pfarren" and "Palm: Cöppelerey").

These examples could be multiplied, but suffice it to say that while any anthology devoted to the German Baroque is welcome, especially one which will open the door to Spanish readers, that is about the most that can be said of this one.

*University of California,  
Berkeley, California*

BLAKE LEE SPAHR

**Wolfgang Pehnt, *Zeiterlebnis und Zeitdichtung in Goethes Lyrik* (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1957. 153 pp.).** THIS Frankfurt dissertation examines Goethe's lyrical work as far as the early Weimar period with respect to its relation to time. In his introduction, the author concedes that several previous studies of Goethe's lyrics have employed temporal categories (e. g. Kommerell), that some more general interpretations have investigated the time-aspect in detail (Staiger, Walzel), and that the symbolic patterns uncovered by Emrich are closely related to Goethe's evaluation of time. But he feels that a more specifically time-centered investigation of Goethe's lyrical output is justified not only by the inherent importance of time as an immanent quality of literature, but also by the importance accorded to time by Goethe himself.

The book is divided into three sections, treating respectively of

the anacreontic period, the Storm and Stress, and the late Frankfurt and early Weimar period.

Written from a pretended position "above" time, the highly artificial anacreontic lyrics regard time as a homogeneous quantum made up of a succession of uniform, repeatable moments. Characteristic images are those of the butterfly and of uniform waves. Feelings of transiency are disposed of by conventional devices like reliques, poems, and renunciation.

The poet moves in the Storm and Stress to a position within the moment. Time now seems a cluster of hermetically sealed and unrepeatable moments. They are "ewig" only qualitatively, i. e. by virtue of their intensity and the poet's utter absorption in them ("Mailied," "Willkommen und Abschied").

But even this qualitatively "eternal" moment is menaced by profane time, of which it is a part. Attempts to extend or transcend this sealed-off moment become evident even in some early poems, e. g. "Schwager Kronos" and "Sturmlied." "Eine Haltung zur Zeit deutet sich an, die nicht länger gewillt ist, sich der alleinigen Herrschaft des grösstenlosen Augenblickes zu beugen" (p. 56). Some of the *Künstlergedichte* written in or about 1774 suggest that the art-work represents a kind of victory over transient time. "Mahomets Gesang" translates time into external nature in the image of the river: "die Zeit des Stromlaufes in 'Mahomets Gesang' ist absolut, weil sie an keiner anderen Zeit gemessen werden kann" (p. 67).

In the Lilli-poems, the sealed-in, ecstatic moment of the Storm and Stress has been broken by motifs of worry, recollection, hope, and self-reflection. "Seefahrt," on the other hand, initiates a positive evaluation of time, which now appears as a path that leads somewhere. Here, and in certain other poems, Pehnt detects early evidences of Goethe's concept of "Kairos": a pre-established order of time, in which certain things can happen only at certain moments.

The triple succession implicit in "Der Wandrer": time destroys the art-work; the art-work becomes nature; nature again engenders art, foreshadows the triadic form which this "vorgeprägte Ordnung der Zeit" gradually assumes in Goethe's thinking. In Part III of his book, Pehnt traces the development of this "Dreischritt als Form der Zeitbewegung"—experienced as *Urzeit*, *Zwischenzeit* and *Wiedergeburt*—in the lyrical output from the Frankfurt to the early Weimar period, giving special attention to "Warum gabst du uns die tiefen Blicke" and "Ilmenau."

The author's intention, announced in the introduction, of making a contribution to a new kind of treatise on Goethe's lyrics, one which investigates the works historically and from points of view that are immanent in them and are not derived from biography, has certainly been accomplished. His study could well form the basis of such an investigation.

*University of South Carolina*

DOUGLAS F. BUB

**Eitel Wolf Dobert, *Deutsche Demokraten in Amerika, Die Achtundvierziger und ihre Schriften* (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1958. 233 pp.).** THE political idealists who risked life and liberty in an attempt to democratize and unify Germany in 1848 have been, despite the failure of their cause, of great influence on the course of German history. The authors of the Weimar Constitution consciously returned to the aims of the Forty-eighters and Theodor Heuss, president of the West German Republic, cites them very frequently in his writings and in his speeches. The chief historian of the Revolution, Veit Valentin, definitely rejects the charge that these men had been political Philistines. On the contrary, he praises the genuine quality of their culture, the clearness of their judgment, and the warmth of their feeling.

In great numbers, the revolutionaries came to the United States to escape death by firing squads. They carried with them their political idealism which they brought into play in the struggle against slavery both in political action and on the battlefield. Many of them also were prolific authors. Their writings are reviewed in the present volume by Professor Dobert in the retrospect of a century. His judgments, expressed succinctly and with historical perspective, make fascinating reading.

The individuals he deals with were men of action as well as of the pen. August Becker, a red-bearded revolutionary, was a chaplain in the Civil War nicknamed "The Word of God on Horseback." Casper Butz was a poet of considerable talent and as journalist a sharp critic of Lincoln whom he considered not sufficiently radical. Friedrich Hassaurek, an enthusiastic orator for the Republican Party, was called by his opponents the "Beerhall Demosthenes." Wilhelm Heine, fighter on the barricades in Dresden, became an officer in the U. S. Navy and took part in Perry's expedition to Japan as well as in

numerous other explorations in Asia and Africa. Friedrich Kapp played an active part in New York politics and on his return to Germany after the declaration of amnesty became a member of the German Reichstag; he was the author of numerous scholarly historical works. Hans Kudlich who played a leading role in freeing the Austrian peasants from serfdom became a practicing gynecologist in Hoboken, humorously alluded to as "The father of Hoboken." Elias Peissner, as a young student in Munich the chivalrous protector of the King's exiled mistress Lola Montez, became a professor of modern languages at Union College; at the outbreak of the Civil War he organized the "Union College Zouaves" and fell at the Battle of Chancellorsville. Wilhelm Weitling, a communist and labor agitator before Karl Marx and probably the first one to be purged from the party, because of his humane point of view, established a communal utopia in Iowa and exerted great influence on the early labor movement in the United States. Sigel, Hecker, and of course Carl Schurz, were military figures in the fighting in Baden and later in our Civil War. To a large part the works of these men are memoirs.

Dr. Dobert reviews the writings of more than fifty of these idealists, "citizens of two worlds," never missing the picturesque aspects of their careers and writings. In the history of German literature he ranks them as *Epigonen des jungen Deutschlands* who because of their enlightened ideas, suffered continually from censorship and persecution by the reactionary governments. Immermann characterized their situation neatly: "It is the misfortune of our time that the governed have more sense than the governing powers."

*The University of Maryland*

ADOLF E. ZUCKER

**Harvey W. Hewett-Thayer, *American Literature as Viewed in Germany, 1818-1861*** (Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1958. 83 pp. \$3.35. Univ. of North Carolina Studies in Comparative Literature, 22). FOR his study on the reception of American literature in Germany from 1818 to 1861 Professor Hewett-Thayer selected two important literary periodicals: *Blätter für literarische Unterhaltung* (founded in 1818) and *Magazin für die Literatur des Auslands* (founded in 1832). The monograph is interestingly written, very carefully documented by means of notes following the text, and supplied with an appendix giving the German version of important passages cited in English in the body of the book. A further device for giving the reader the real flavor of the German critics' warm

approval or contemptuous condemnation is the insertion of the German original after a key word in the English translation of a critic's remark.

While this latter is a minor matter, the author's evaluation of German terms provides an opportunity for a moment's fascinated lingering on the reader's part as to whether or not he agrees with the author. Twice Professor Hewett-Thayer meets with a term often described as untranslatable: *Gemütlichkeit*, hearty simplicity (of the hamlet) and *gemülich*, cheerful and charming (descriptions of hunting and fishing). Some further translations are: *sinnig*, reflective (poet); *geistvoll*, intelligent (thinker, i. e. Emerson); *geistreich*, true and stimulating; *Duft*, atmosphere; *freimütig*, candid; *ein Weiser*, a philosopher; *Aufschneiderei*, boasting; *reellere*, more candid. Examples could be multiplied, but the reader will probably agree that Professor Hewett-Thayer has generally come very close to the German meaning.

The study shows, as has frequently been pointed out, that the Germans have been more receptive to foreign literatures than most other nations, and in general friendly toward American authors. Herman Grimm speaks of Emerson as "a newly discovered continent" (p. 51). Professor Friedrich von Raumer states that Prescott's *Ferdinand and Isabella* is "by far the most thorough and best written book on the most attractive period of Spanish history" (p. 55). One critic finds that the Americans have not yet overcome "die schauderhaft nüchterne, gemeinpraktische und hinterpommersch-orthodox-puritanische Gesinnung und Gesittung" (p. 8). He finds that Lowell possesses genuine poetic talent, but that he will indulge in "leichtsinniges Geschreibsel" and "albernes Gefasel" (p. 11). Poe is regarded as America's most original and gifted poet, "unrivalled (unerreichbar) in harmony of form and feeling, in rhythmic expression and originality of conception" (p. 11). Longfellow receives high praise as "an almost completely German poet" (p. 11). But a few years later he is the victim of a scornful, belittling essay "which leaves hardly anything to the poet but technical dexterity." He is prudish, sentimental, little capable of becoming a true interpreter of German poets, lacks inner ferment, has not outgrown boyish ideas, serves us borrowed poetry; the *Building of the Ships* is a good idea, but meager as compared with Schiller's *Glocke*; *Hiawatha* relates the dullest and most tasteless legends, but yet his tender tones may be recommended to the rude Americans of the present day (p. 45).

Professor Hewett-Thayer states in conclusion that this record of American literature offers no clear and consistent pattern; as one

might expect, the critics cited differ fundamentally in their attitude toward the new literature of America. In general their attitude is more appreciative than that of British journals of the day; in fact there is occasional defense of American ways against British diatribes, such as the travel books of Mrs. Trollope and others. Patriotic pride at times leads to the exaggeration of the influence of German literature and thought.

*The University of Maryland*

ADOLF E. ZUCKER

Einar Ól. Sveinsson, *Dating the Icelandic Sagas: An Essay in Method* (London: Viking Society for Northern Research, 1958. x + 127 pp. *Viking Society for Northern Research Text Series*, ed. G. Turville-Petre, 3). THIS essay, as the General Editor G. Turville-Petre tells us, is a pioneer work, for no general treatment of the subject has been published since modern methods of criticism have been applied. The author, who toured America in 1958, France and China in 1959, with lectures on the sagas, is, barring the *Altmeister* Sigurður Nordal, the greatest authority on the Icelandic sagas. He has just turned sixty. Of his many books, the one on the *Sturlunga Age* has been translated into English by Jóhann Hannesson in *Islandica* 1953.

The author treats his subject in fifteen chapters: earlier researches, technical terms, manuscripts and texts, alterations in the texts, subjective and objective evidence, references to sagawriting in early texts, the ages of manuscripts, historical evidence, family sagas and contemporary history, literary relations, linguistic evidence, clerical and romantic influences, artistry, heroic sagas and the decline of realism, and a conclusion.

Readers will find here hints on new editions of the sagas though they are far from complete. As an example may be mentioned that Einar Ól. Sveinsson in preparing his monumental edition of *Njáls saga*, surveyed all the vellum MSS of the saga, but not the many paper MSS of the saga, a classification for which remains to be done. The same is true of paper MSS of *Egils saga*, as Professor Jón Helgason showed in an article in *Nordæla*. In his opinion all manuscripts should be used for a basic edition of sagas, most of which remain to be done.

Of historical evidence, Einar Ól. Sveinsson mentions two striking examples by which a saga can be dated. One is a mention of Christian ordeals in *Laxdæla saga*, forbidden by the church in 1247, the other

is the influence of the legal codex of *Járnsíða* (1271) on *Njáls saga*, but not *Jónsbók* (1281).

The literary relations of the sagas to each other, but especially their relation to different versions of *Landnámabók* is one of the best means of dating the sagas, though by no means always quite clear. Of this important work, the original by Kolskeggr and Ari must have been ready before Ari's death in 1148. Next was a lost *Styrmisbók* (ca. 1220), then *Sturlubók* (ca. 1280), then *Hauksbók* (ca. 1330) and a *Melabók* (ca. 1313), badly preserved. Finally there were *Skarðsárbók* (ante 1655) and *Pórðarbók* (ante 1670). Of these *Sturlubók*, especially, contains a great deal of matter culled from the family sagas before 1280.

In these difficult matters Einar Ól. Sveinsson follows the reconstructions of the late Jón Jóhannesson of *Landnáma*'s history though he doubts it in minor points. Unfortunately, Einar Ól. Sveinsson does not give his opinion of Jóhannesson's dating of *Grænlendinga saga* before 1200 in *Nordæla*. Perhaps, like Nordal himself he is not quite convinced by this dating though it looks tempting enough. It is of course, a reversal of Hermannsson's dating.

The chapter on the language of the saga MSS may be of special interest to foreign students looking for dissertation subjects. Some of these linguistic marks seem to be good dating devices. Commenting (pp. 102-3) on spellings like *Brunnolf-* for *Brynjólfur*, *Sauðar-* for *Seyðarfjörðr*, *fullar* for *fyllar*; *-sort* for *sært*, *súrar* for *sýrar*, *lungs* for *lyngs*, *bona* for *bæna*, Einar Ól. Sveinsson asks himself whether the spellings *u*, *o* do not represent the original sound not umlauted. I would rather guess that these would be French spellings, which were at this time common in Middle English, especially Southern English.

This must be enough though there would be much more to report on this important work. The lack of index is a drawback, though a minor one, since the book is so small. Thanks are due to all having a hand in this publication, not least so the General Editor, Turville-Petre. In a preface the author lists works bearing on his subject published after September 1956 when the essay was completed. Among these publications: *Nordæla*, a festschrift to Nordal 1956, and Barði Guðmundsson's posthumous *Höfundur Njálu* (1958) are most important.

*The Johns Hopkins University*

**STEFAN EINARSSON**

---

## Announcing A New Book

# POPE'S EPISTLE TO BATHURST

*A Critical Reading with an Edition of the Manuscript*

by EARL R. WASSERMAN

144 pages

\$7.50

Of his *Epistle to Bathurst* Pope wrote, "I never took more care in my life of any other poem." The implication is that he endowed it with more than an ordinary degree of his artistry and esteemed it as an especially important work. This book studies the Epistle as a tightly integrated work of art through an analysis of its rhetorical strategy, its theological and ethical assumptions, and its richly allusive imagery. Pope emerges as a poet of strong religious commitments whose learning is more deeply rooted in the earlier traditions than has customarily been assumed. His satiric poetry is a sharp picture of the political and moral conditions of Augustan society and life, and his own subtle judgments upon them.

A complete photographic reproduction of the three Huntington Library manuscripts of the *Epistle to Bathurst* is included; each page of photographs is accompanied by a facing transcription. Since the manuscripts were heavily revised by Pope—and are the only extant manuscripts known today—they provide an unusual opportunity to observe Pope in the process of poetic creation.

As a detailed and careful analysis, this book is of immense value to students of the eighteenth century, the Augustan Age, and those who wish to relate Pope, the epitome of the age, to the stream of English literary, ethical, and religious tradition.

*order from your bookstore or,*

**THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS, Baltimore 18, Maryland**

---